



UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

813

D596a

1860



M. J. G. G. G.

1875

T 1

125

ANNA CLAYTON;

OR

The Enquirer after Truth.

BY

REV. FRANCIS MARION DIMMICK, A. M.

BUY THE TRUTH AND SELL IT NOT: ALSO WISDOM AND INSTRUCTION, AND UNDERSTANDING.—THE LORD WILL NOT SUFFER THE SOUL OF THE RIGHTEOUS TO FAMISH.—*King Solomon.*

SECOND EDITION.

PHILADELPHIA:
LINDSAY & BLAKISTON.
1860.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1859, by
LINDSAY & BLAKISTON,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District
of Pennsylvania.

STEREOTYPED BY J. FAGAN. . . . PRINTED BY C. SHERMAN & SON.

813

D5962

1860

Beloved Parents.

BOTH gratitude and filial affection prompt the dedication of this volume to you. Your kindness and watchful care over your children should meet with some return. Your self-denying labors in their infancy, your Christian instructions and admonitions in their childhood, the expressions of your deep solicitude and anxieties for their temporal and eternal interests in maturer years, can be but feebly repaid by the most dutiful of children. May God in his infinite goodness grant you, both, a full restoration to health and strength, and that the remainder of your pilgrimage below may be happy and joyous; and that your decline of life may be blessed with ever-increasing foretastes of eternal bliss.

“Sweet is the image of the brooding dove!
Holy as heaven a parent’s tender love!
The love of many prayers, and many tears,
Which changes not with dim declining years.”

PREFACE.

THE arguments contained in this work, were mainly presented in a series of letters to a sister—MRS. DIANTHA DIMMICK REYNOLDS—who was then unsettled on the subject herein discussed, and was seeking to know the Bible truth of the matter.

She was flooded with Baptist documents, but was unwilling to endorse their views until she had carefully and intelligently investigated the whole subject. She requested me to come to her assistance in meeting and examining the arguments and doctrines laid before her. My studies occupied nearly the whole of my time; but a sister's call is never to be allowed to pass unheeded, and especially when matters of eternal interests are pending.

By the arguments presented to her, and by suggestions as to the proper study of the Bible in determining its teachings and doctrines, she was led to see, as she believed, the errors, false statements, and illogical reasonings of our Baptist brethren. My sister felt the need of a *popular* treatment of this subject in her own case; and having passed through the ordeal, could judge pretty correctly what kind of a work seemed to be demanded by the great mass of the Christian church, and by those seeking to gain entrance to it. By her aid in popularizing the arguments, they are now presented to the kind attentions and regards of a Christian public.

There is no work, to my knowledge, of the kind, covering the whole subject, and presenting the Pedobaptist side of the controversy. But our Baptist brethren have no less than two or three very popular ones in the field; which have made hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of proselytes to their peculiar belief; and shaken the faith of many others, who thought themselves established and grounded in the doctrine of Pedobaptism. They have even drawn them from the very ranks of Pedobaptist churches to swell the numbers of their own. A work, then, acting as an antidote to these; meeting them upon their own ground; pointing out their fallacies, errors, mis-statements, and false assertions, seems to be greatly needed and demanded by the great branches of the Christian church.

And, further, it is hoped, that this work may, in some degree, turn the attention of Christians, and especially of teachers in the church, to the great sinfulness, and to the un-Christlike spirit they exhibit in the bitter feelings they engender, and the enmity they beget, between brethren in Christ, in their sectarian zeal of proselyting.

Knowing that God often chooses to work by humble instrumentalities, and to make use of the weak things of this world to confound the wise and mighty; therefore, that the cause of truth may be advanced, and the glory of God promoted by the prevalence of the pure doctrines of his word; that the hearts of all Christians may flow together in the great work of saving souls; and that there may be a unanimity of purpose and action in the worship of God, and in the upbuilding of his kingdom, this little volume is sent forth into the world to exert its feeble influence, and to await the result.

F. M. D.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

	PAGE
Noontide on a midsummer day—Clayton Family—The subject of Baptism brought forward—The ground surveyed—Positions assumed—Father Longwind arrives—Trouble anticipated—The World glanced at and commiserated—The field and harvest—George and Anna—Private interview—Halley announced	13

CHAPTER II.

A morning in June—Anna feels her loneliness and calls for her sainted mother—Her resolve—Father Longwind broaches the subject to Anna, and is surprised at her ready answers—He beats a retreat—Anna's Meditation on the Distractions of the Christian Church, and prays for Unity.....	26
---	----

CHAPTER III.

Difficulties met—The plan of investigation settled upon—The New Testament use of the word βαπτισμ sought after—Its Spiritual import shown—Its Typical nature looked into—Consistency in the Word of God.....	37
--	----

CHAPTER IV.

“Baptism of Suffering” inquired after—The <i>manner</i> of the Spirit Baptism considered — The Baptism with which Christ was to be baptized — Baptism found to symbolize Spiritual purification — Father Longwind returns with Elder Burton — Some questions considered	51
---	----

CHAPTER V.

Widow Giles — Her troubles — Her kindness to Anna — A visit — A surprise—Anna’s real mother— <i>βαπτίζω</i> still considered—Hel- lenistic Greek—The growth of Language, and the change of the signification of words—Witness called—The Itala and the Peshitc versions of the New Testament—Our own version a good witness —New words found in the New Testament Greek, and new mean- ings to old ones — The same in our language — The use of the word <i>βαπτίζω</i> determined and settled—The Jewish modes of puri- fying considered — The Greek prepositioes <i>ἐν</i> , <i>εἰς</i> , and <i>ἀπό</i> — The law governing translators — Perfect harmony and consistency in the Bible, if properly studied	65
--	----

CHAPTER VI.

Elder Clayton’s mind unsettled—Interview with Brother Burton— A plan devised—A charge made; the thrust parried—An unex- pected Competitor — Halley takes up the gauntlet thrown at Anna — Water Baptism no symbol of the Death and Burial of Christ—Custom of the Greeks and Romans with respect to their dead—Christ and the Believer—Water Baptism the shadow, and Spirit Baptism the substance—The analogical argument: taking immersionists upon their own ground and showing the absurdity and inconsistency of their position — A defeat inevitable; a re- treat ordered; a flight ensues — The outward act wholly sub- ordinate: illustration—The impracticability of immersion on all occasions: it does not harmonize with the other ordinance, and with the spirit and teachings of the Bible — The onus probandi

thrown upon the Baptists — The Lord's Supper and its abuse in Paul's time — An unexpected but unavoidable inference — The essence of all God's commands spiritual — Tendency of formalism — A summing up of the evidences — One Churchism 99

CHAPTER VII.

The Warning — The struggle and resolve — The lying in wait — Anna visits Widow Giles — The darkness gathers — A new advocate — The field carefully surveyed — Unexpected conclusions for a new inquirer — The difficult questions solving themselves — The proper view of the ordinance of Baptism 134

CHAPTER VIII.

The trap sprung — The biter bit — The intended victim escapes — Unity was our Savior's prayer — CLOSE COMMUNION deprecated — Its reasons searched for in vain — The Sabbath and Communion — A new Shepherd looking after the flock — Love is the fulfilling of the law — The sky darkens — Interview: Anna and her foster father — Close Communion discountenanced — Smith family — A church — Sudden appearance of Brother Burton and Mother Clayton — A storm — The pastor wanders, and the flock follows — Brother Burton seeks different and more congenial quarters — The sky clears, and nature smiles again 161

CHAPTER IX.

The Widow's bud of promise blighted — Squire Tanner introduced — The discussions opened — The *kind* of evidences considered — The demand for *positive* proof shown to be absurd — Illustrated — Man no right to prescribe God — Moral evidences the guide of life — Should be satisfied with just such kind of evidences as God sees proper to give — The great Commission — Its application shown — An undesirable conclusion even for Baptists deduced from their own arguments — The relation of Children to the Church — Objections to Infant Baptism removed — The Covenant

of Grace—The Church founded in the family of Abraham — No new Church established—Baptism long practised by the Jews—The Abrahamic church organization recognized, and its promises confirmed by Christ and the Apostles — The Baptist position incompatible with Paul’s teachings and expositions—The Covenant everlasting — The advantages accruing — Children and Parents indissolubly connected—God’s Covenant has never been changed or abrogated—The onus probandi where?—The ground reviewed in the light of the New Testament teachings—Mr. Graves on trial and convicted..... 192

C H A P T E R X .

The establishing of a new Church looked after in vain—The mission of Christ—Circumcision and Baptism compared—Severe charges where to be applied —Were infants excluded from church jurisdiction among the Jewish Christians in the time of the Apostles? — The absurdity of the position of those who exclude them — Peter and Paul included them—Some conclusions—Drs. Edwards, Woods, and Lightfoot — “The kingdom of heaven belongs to children” — The Great Head of the Church recognizes them — The Obligation resting on parents: if faithful, the result — Influence of the mother — The Children of believing parents born members of Christ’s Church — 1. Cor. vii. 14 examined — Illustration of Baptist arguments—The term “faithful” — The Catacombs of Rome and their testimony — Family Baptisms in the New Testament; Children only included — *Oἶκος* and *oikia* — Dr. Kurtz and Rev. E. Hall — Inference — A Challenge — The Evidence satisfactory 234

C H A P T E R X I .

Elder Mason introduced—Statements of Brother Graves considered —Coleman, Neander, and Irenæus—Graves and Carson virtually deny Infant Salvation—Justin Martyr and Tertullian interrogated — Their answers do harmonize with some Baptist statements made of them—Origen, and his testimony—A Challenge—Graves and Pengilly; their false representations of the views of Cranmer, Luther, Calvin, Pilgrim Fathers, Dr. Wall, Bishop Burnet,

Richard Baxter, Dr. Miller, Dr. Dwight, and Bishop Taylor — Unexpected result—General view—Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, and his council of divines — Optatus and Gregory — No Baptist yet found—Ambrose and Chrysostom—Augustine, Pelagius, and Celestius—What had become of the Baptist churches?—The unbroken chain of historical argument—Sweeping assertions considered — The united voice of early church history — Novatians and Donatists — Inferential — Evidences from the Catacombs of Rome and from the Church Fathers harmonize — Questions propounded—Unaccountable silence — Summing up — Challenge — One hook more — Elder Clayton's troublesome thoughts — Great Iron Wheel—Off the track—Reaction—The foster Mother—The real position..... 292

CHAPTER XII.

An interested audience — The Baptist claim set forth by Elder Mason — The claim inspected and pinned down — The river of Baptist ancestry to be navigated—All the "Regular" boats stop at an "INDEPENDENT" wharf of the 17th century—Close Communion thrown overboard to reach *it*, even! — The river not navigable farther—Elder Mason insists that all "Baptists are Baptists," and resolves on an overland route direct to the Apostles through the Mennonites and Anabaptists — The real source of Calvinistic Baptists settled—Dr. Mosheim—The Mennonites' temple of faith examined and compared with that of the Particular Baptists of those times — The connection between Mennonites and Anabaptists investigated—Origin of Anabaptists and character of the sect—Thomas Munzer — Conflicting testimony from a Baptist author — The expediency of having two sets of arguments—Elder Mason retires from the field of controversy—The survey still continued — The Waldenses located and their antiquity established—Their doctrines and faith determined—At the Reformation they readily united with the Reformed Pedobaptist churches—They are, and always have been, Pedobaptists — They were not immersionists—The Petrobrusians the first sect in the history of the Church which practised only adult baptism (1150)! — The Pedobaptist chain connected and welded — Albigenes, Paulicans, Cathari or Puritans, and Paternines — Mr.

Graves' trials in establishing his "regular Apostolical succession"—Retrospect taken in summing up—Non-essentials should be no barrier to Christian unity and love—The prospect—The Christian Parent..... 357

CHAPTER XIII.

The effects of the controversy showing itself in the hearers—Subdiscussions—The general feeling—The farmer, an illustration—The great variety of mind—Father Benjamine—The Clayton kitchen, and Widow Giles—Elder Clayton; his absent brother: the spirit of love prevails—The arbor in the lower garden; Anna, her thoughts; Halley; the Explanation—Anna learns her parentage from the lips of her own brother—The Sabbath—A Revival—An Autumn Sabbath—The gathering at church—Union—A Christian's creed—A familiar face in the pulpit—The accessions to the church—Communion—An interested Spectator—The village church-yard—Anna meets her father—Sorrows unloosened by tears—The heavenly atmosphere—The father and daughter—Unanimity in God's family proclaimed—The effect of divisions—God's armory for his servants—The foster father—Where the difficulty lies—Anna drawing a contrast—Union prayer meeting—Anna, and her brother Henry, return with their father—The ultimate effect of unity and love among Christians..... 395

ANNA CLAYTON;

OR,

THE INQUIRER AFTER TRUTH.

CHAPTER I.

“Green fields and silent glens! We come
To spend this summer day with you.”

NOONTIME in a farmer's house, on a sultry summer day, is a picture all are familiar with. Windows and doors are thrown open to their utmost capacity to admit any passing puff of wind which may chance to stray that way; and the various members of the household who have turned away with sated appetites from the well-spread board, lounge here and there, as inclination may dictate—upon the chairs or floor—within the balcony—or on the green grass beneath the shielding branches of some neighboring tree, enjoying an hour of unbroken stillness and repose.

In Nature's vast domain of forest and field, there is a depth of stillness only equalled by the noon of night. The cattle

have left their grazing in the open field, and sought the babbling brook and the overhanging tree. The birds, which awoke a chorus of melody in the orchards and meadows, when the day was cool and fresh, have now sought the deep wood, and underneath the dense foliage are dreaming bird dreams. Everything is at rest. Even the white clouds, which hang up against the blue of heaven, seem motionless and changeless as the eternal hills beneath them.

And at this hour in an arm-chair with his feet elevated to the window-sill, sits Elder Clayton—the senior member of the Clayton family. He is evidently thinking, not of the fields on which his eyes are resting, although they seem to linger there with the pride of ownership; but evidently of another field of labor, where the seed is the word, and the harvest the souls of men. He is a strong-built, muscular man, and shows the marks of toil in the natural as well as the spiritual field. He wears an honest broad face, and a kindly smile.

Near him sits a fair young girl, with a broad, full brow, and deep, thoughtful eyes. Her pervading air is one of quiet dignity and calm repose. She is reading—is always reading. She is called Anna Clayton, though her real name is Ella Forbes. She was left an orphan, when a small child, and has lived in this family, shared its comforts and privileges, as though she were a natural heir.

Almost at her feet, lying upon the floor with Sporter—who, by the way, is a large Newfoundland dog, answering, at present, for a pillow—is George; a young man of twenty, and an only child.

Nearly behind this group is Mrs. Clayton, in an old straight-backed chair, and sits as straight and prim as the chair itself. She is the only one of the family who never finds a leisure hour, and at this moment is knitting as though her life depended on it. She has a compressed mouth, thin, peaked nose, and sharp eyes, with a flash in them. You will discover, at a

glance, that she is a woman of an indomitable will, and capable of strong prejudices and bitter animosities.

“What is it you are reading?” she said, glancing over her spectacles in her most impressive manner. “What is it you are reading, Anna?”

The truth was, she knew well enough, but thought it a proper time to evince her displeasure.

“It is a book I got at Uncle’s, the other day,” she replied. “It treats of the different kinds of denominational faith, under their different heads; or, rather, it is an exposition of them, as prepared by their most eminent men; together with a review, or summing up, of the arguments by the editor. I think it is very interesting.”

“What, did you get it at John’s? He is one of the rankest kind of Methodists. I don’t believe it’s fit to be read,” continued Mrs. Clayton.

“If it’s all as sound Baptist orthodoxy,” said George, “as that which Anna and I were reading, last night, I don’t think mother Clayton would object to it. How is it, Anna? Is it sound all the way through?”

“It treats also of other kinds of denominational faith,” she replied, “or else it would not be correctly titled.”

“Well, yes, of course,” continued George; “but what heresy does it inculcate? That’s the point at issue, as our old college Prof. would say.”

“I’m not prepared to answer such a question,” she replied, gravely; “but I hope to know sometime why these differences distract the Christian world.”

“These differences are very sad,” said Elder Clayton. “Of course we would like to have them all see as we see. But if they *won’t*, why I’m sure it is’nt our fault. Yes, my children,” he continued, looking round as though speaking to a congregation, “no one laments these things more than we do; they come right home to our hearts. We would be glad to embrace

in the arms of Christian love and fellowship, every kindred, tongue, and people, if they would but come in the proper manner, and in the gospel order of things."

"Come under the water, I suppose;" George suggested, glancing mischievously at Anna, from under his heavy eye-lashes.

"George, hav'nt you any respect for sacred things?" exclaimed his mother, sternly.

"Why, what did I say? Nothing bad, was it? Somehow there is always something slipping from my tongue wrong end first. I can never get the right word in the right place. Sis, hand me that book. I'm bound to do something for my country yet. I'll blow those *Pedos* up so high, they won't come down in a century—see if I don't." Thus saying, George took the book, and holding it off at arm's-length, scrutinized it closely on its several sides; then closely shutting his eyes, opened it by chance, and read with the earnestness of a school-boy conning his first lesson in a new book.

"The great question now before the Christian world, and the only one that divides it in fellowship and communion, is that of Baptism. On one side it is maintained that the only proper way of administering it, is by the immersion of believers in water on the profession of their faith; and on the other hand, that it may be, and is, just as properly administered by sprinkling or pouring, as by immersion; and that the children of believers are included in the privileges of the rite. The defenders of the first position, generally known as Baptists, insist on adhering to the literal meaning of the Greek word, βαπτίζω, (baptizo), and consequently maintain, that a command to baptize, is a command to *immerse*.

They also defend their practice, from the phrase "Buried with him in Baptism," and from the early custom of repairing to rivers to administer the ordinance. They further claim, with the greatest assurance, to be the only true Church of Christ.

On the other hand, those known as Pedobaptists declare that βαπτίζω (baptizo) would not be correctly rendered by the term immerse; but that it is a *generic* term, implying only the rite of baptism, with no reference whatever to the mode. That baptism is symbolic, an emblem of the purifying influences of the Holy Spirit, and that the grand and leading type of purification, instituted by Jehovah himself, is sprinkling: that immersion can no where be found in the Bible as an ordinance, either implied, acknowledged, sanctioned or commanded."

"That will do, George," said the Elder Clayton; hitching nervously in his chair: "it appears to me that is an unwarrantable position."

"Unwarrantable?" exclaimed Mrs. Clayton, who had been rapidly brimming up, and, now there was one drop too many added, she went off in a torrent: "Unwarrantable, I guess it is—it's blasphemy! I wish I'd throw'd the book into the fire! I don't see what anybody wants to meddle with such things for. My father and mother lived and died in the Baptist Church, and that faith is good enough for me; and now just to hear the like of that, that there an't any immersion in the Bible—It's blasphemy! that's what it is—I won't hear such stuff!" And she bolted from the room, slamming the door after her in a manner that enforced her opinions.

There followed an awkward pause. George rolled his eyes up toward Anna, and drew down his mouth for an inaudible whistle: but Anna sat riveted to her chair, as though suddenly stricken by a power that deprived her of motion. Fortunately, the silence was broken by a horse and horseman coming up on a leisurely trot to the gate. The man dismounted, took off a capacious pair of saddlebags, and, pulling his hat down over his eyes, with true clerical dignity, walked up to the door. Elder Clayton greeted him warmly, and the two walked into the study.

"There now," said George, "that's what I call an interposi-

tion of Providence; nothing else could have sent old Father Longwind here, just at this time, on one of his longwinded visits. Anna, what's the matter! Why don't you look up?"

"George, you won't turn away from me, will you, if all the rest of the world does?—You will pity me?" She said this in a tone of hopeless pleading.

"Pity you? Why, what for, Anna?"

"I do not know what to do."

"Do? Why let them blow away, to be sure: guess I'd read what I was a mind to, for all anybody says—if they don't want to hear it, why, they know their privilege."

"But, George, they have been kind to me—as truly a father and mother to me as to you; what have I—what am I—that I do not owe to their care and indulgence? and to do anything to grieve them——"

"As for that, it seems to me to be a small matter to read or not to read a book;" replied George, interrupting her.

"A *small* matter! So it may seem to them and to you, but to me it is a fearful necessity. George, sit down here, and I will tell you how it is with me. I look around the world upon a strangely intermingled mass of good and evil. I see some natures almost wholly given up to depravity, rolling sin as a sweet morsel under their tongues, and others professing to be good, professing to be children of one common Father, recipients of the same Atoning blood, under the same laws, to be travellers and pilgrims here with *one* object, to labor in a common cause, and to be journeying to the same eternal blessed rest;—and yet I see this body of professing Christians split up into factions, and so blinded by prejudice, as almost to forget their Master's work, in zeal for their own particular sect—it grieves me. And when one starts up and says, *You* are altogether wrong, and *we* are altogether right; your church is *no church*, and ours is the only *true* church—it startles me, and I wish to know by what right they urge such claims as these. Now I feel it

my duty to profess Christ before the world. I cannot do this without connecting myself with some existing body of Christians. Can I do this blindly, knowing but one sect, and making this sect my *Master's kingdom*? No! I dare not. Should I go with my friends, allowing them to be a guide to my conscience—believing as they believe, simply because they believe it? Can they stand before the judgment-seat of Christ in my stead and answer for me? No! you know they cannot—then how can they here? This matter is entirely between my soul and God. Do you not, then, see that it is an imperative necessity with me, that I go contrary to their wishes? Do you wonder that I feel that it is at my soul's peril if I refuse to investigate, decide, and act?"

"That is very reasonable, Anna," said George; "just so I have thought it over and over, only, you see, I sum it up differently. I say to myself, that it is evident from the facts in the case, that the devil has it pretty much his own way, and will get the larger part of them, and me too, if we go on the way we are going; and——"

"O George, I wish you felt a deeper interest in these things."

"And so I would if all the world were like you, Anna; but there is no use talking about that. You said, Pity me—I *do* pity you, Anna, with your views of individual responsibility, your all-embracing brotherly love and fellowship, which I admit are true Gospel principles, and if *lived* out would make all the world Christians—with your clear insight into the absurdity of things, and your shrinking, sensitive soul—why, Anna, if you are to be thrown into this whirlpool of contending elements and prejudices, you might, better by far, throw yourself into Maelstrom's whirling waters—faintly hoping at some time to be cast out upon the coast of Norway—that's my opinion."

"But, George, should I not follow the path of duty, no matter where it leads me?"

"Yes, go on, Anna, and may Heaven guard you—and if it don't, I don't know what will."

“Thank you, George: that strengthens me, and I begin to feel brave to do, and strong to bear.”

“But, Anna,” said George, breaking the silence which followed, in which both seemed lost in their own thoughts, “you have no conception of the strength of religious prejudices—you can never bear up against them. After all, I believe my philosophy is the wisest. What can a body do but take the world as he finds it: laugh at its absurdities, whether they be comic or tragic, and let it go at that. This world is a thankless master. How has it regarded some of its greatest benefactors whilst living? You know how it was with our Savior. And even in modern times, you know how it has been with such men as Columbus, Galileo, Milton, Bunyan, Baxter, and a host of reformers. To be sure, after they were dead, they began to estimate what these men had done for the world’s progress; and many of them have been toasted and lauded ever since in a way that must be astonishing to those illustrious shades, if they walk to and fro in the earth, and up and down in it, as a certain wicked one did in olden times. The fact is, Anna, if a luckless wight happens to stumble on an idea which is in advance of the world’s progress, he is laughed at, and forthwith every ragged urchin or upstart in the street thinks it his duty to throw rotten eggs at him. What they do after his death an’t of much consequence—wouldn’t be to me, anyhow: it don’t provide his bread and butter when he most wants it. So you see my philosophy is a sort of necessity to me, as yours is to you. Come, Anna, what do you say to that?” said George, for she was silent, sad, and thoughtful, with her eyes fixed on the floor.

“There is much truth in what you say, George. But it seems to me, when one gigantic mind soars up above its fellows, and grasps a principle involving a great good, and bestows it upon the world, free as the winds and waters of heaven, knowing that the world will deride the gift, or its object, and the

one who bestowed it; refusing in its blindness or ignorance, or accepting it thanklessly, that that mind has arrived at the highest possible point of moral grandeur attainable in this world. He approaches the Divine standard, just in proportion to the unselfishness of the object. And I would rather be such an one, with bread and water for my food, the skins of beasts for my clothing, and a cave of the earth for my dwelling-place, than to have the wealth of princes, and live as selfishly as most of the world are living. No. Let us labor for the world's good. If there are evils, let us make an effort to eradicate them. Let not our own good be the one object of life, but also the good of others. Let us seek to know the right—to do the right—to maintain the right—live for it and die for it, if need be—we cannot die in a better cause."

"Poh! Anna, you are an enthusiast—a dreamer! True, it *sounds* well enough, but it won't do to *live* in this manner, the way the world goes now. The mischief is, every one thinks that he is right—no matter what absurd notions he gets into his head—he is right—he and his alone are right. And they invariably make up, for lack of argument to sustain their position, by pertinaciously insisting that *they* know they're right!"

"But truth *must* triumph," responded Anna, "and the world is making progress, though we need not trouble ourselves about the effect of this or that cause: the question is, *is it right?* If it *is*, then, there is the path of duty—walk ye in it. God controls the results. If I cannot convince all the world of truth, that is no reason why *I* should *forsake* it. If I cannot make this or that error appear to the minds of others—if I fail—my object was not so much to make others see as I see, as to satisfy my own conviction of duty, and to stand justified before God. It seems to me, that the first thing to be learned is, *to know for myself what is TRUTH*, and then fearlessly to oppose the wrong."

"Anna, you are a brave girl. I believe you have motives to

actuate you, and principles to sustain you, that I know nothing about. Why I verily believe you would walk up to the stake, as you would to your dinner. I thought that kind of people were all dead long ago. It must be that they are, Anna, and I'm afraid your notions will have to warp a little—just a little, you know—'twould'nt be of much consequence, and the world would go on so much smoother."

Anna did not reply. George was older, and had seen much more of the world:—his warning sounded fearfully ominous, and she inwardly prayed to be kept from the evil to come.

Within the study which was on the second floor of the Clayton house, the two ministerial friends sat engaged in earnest conversation. The windows were thrown open to admit the lazy swells of air, that now and then lifted themselves up from the forest, swept over the meadows, rustled the corn-leaves, whispered to the locust-trees, which skirted the yard, and then playing with the window drapery, passed on, and with the softest of fingers lifted gently their locks, and sunk to rest on their damp brows. These windows overlooked not only forest, meadow and corn-field, but in the perspective there was a glimpse of the village of A——, with its church-steeple overtopping the tallest trees, and appearing a common centre, around which the white houses were peeping through the foliage.

This might have been suggestive to Elder Clayton, for his eyes were fixed on it as he listened to a graphic sketch of his friend's labors since last they met.

"It has really been a refreshing season," said Brother Longwind, "a wonderful ingathering of souls this last winter. The Lord has truly been gracious to his people. Our churches are exceedingly prosperous wherever I have been." I would remark here in a pause of the speaker, as Elder Clayton fervently ejaculated, "Thank the Lord,"—that Father Longwind, as he was generally called, was a missionary employed by the associa-

tion with which he was connected, to visit vacant fields, build up new churches, and to strengthen the weak. "I understand," he continued, "that the Lord has been here with a blessing, bringing numbers into the flock, not forgetting your own household—is it so, Brother Clayton?"

"It is true," replied Elder Clayton, "last Sabbath I baptized five, and there are others yet to come forward. A few perhaps are leaning towards the Methodists, but I think with a little looking after, they may all be brought along. By the way, have you any of our publications with you? I think if I had some works on Baptism and Communion, to pass round here, they would be just the thing."

"Hav'nt got one with me—sorry—sold them all out! You've no idea what numbers of them I'm scattering round, as I go from one town to another. I just say, here's a good book, would'nt you like to buy? It is pleasantly written—cheap, too, only so much, and if you can't afford to buy it, I will give it to you; and the consequence is, of course, they take one or two, and sometimes a whole set. But, brother, I'm going to N—— to-morrow to get a new supply. These books are just what you want; I'll bring two or three sets on purpose for you, and I'll warrant that with them, you'll bring all your charge around right. How is it with Anna? She was always quick and thoughtful. I used to think she was'nt far from the kingdom."

"Well, I don't know, I wish you would talk with her. Mother and I thought, of course, she would come on at our last Covenant Meeting. Mother even prepared her clothes for the water; but she said that she would rather wait; and now she has got a book which she is reading, that I don't approve of at all; indeed, I didn't know anything about it till to-day."

"Ah! what is it?"

"I really don't know myself, some theological discussion, I should think, though she had just commenced reading as you came in."

“I don’t approve of women and children meddling with such matters at all,” said Brother Longwind, with a long-drawn sigh, “they make such bad work of it always. What can they know of the evidences pro and con, on questions which puzzle our wisest heads.”

“You know,” said Brother Clayton, smiling, “it is given to the simplest of this world to confound the wise; and as to capacity for perceiving points at issue, Anna is not much inferior to the best. I would like to have you talk with her; you understand these things better than I do. The difficulty with Anna is, she is never satisfied until she sounds to the bottom of everything that interests her — she must go to the bottom — to the very bottom of everything. Come, Brother Longwind, let’s walk down to the village; I have some calls to make to-day.” Thus saying, the two set out leisurely down the way, enjoying the deep shade of the maples, which skirted either side along the road, stretching on far over the point of the hill; nor did they return till the sun had snatched a last burning kiss from the glowing hill-tops, over which the clouds hung, and blushed crimson at the sight.

“I’ve got some glorious news for you,” said George, bursting into the room where Anna was sitting, just at nightfall, with an open letter in his hand; “some glorious news for you, Anna! My college chum, Halley, is coming down to the ‘Old Bird’s Nest.’ I told him he’d better, for we were literally overflowing with milk and honey here, with an abundance of maple ’lasses, and also another kind, much sweeter and rarer, with green fields, trout-brooks, and a trusty old musket also among our superfluities, besides other things too numerous to mention. And what’s better yet, Anna, he’s going to be here this very night.”

“I think your friend will be welcome,” said Anna, with a quiet smile.

“Well, Anna, you are refreshingly cool, anyhow. But, you

see, you don't discover the beauties of it as I do. Halley is a glorious fellow, as cute as a lawyer and as deep as a sage. I've heard him argue on these theological questions, and I tell you he can measure the length and breadth of them as well as anybody I ever saw. Why he talks like a preacher; in fact, I believe he is going to make one."

"Ah!" said Anna, her eye lighting up with interest, "perhaps we may get some information from him, then."

"Yes, that's it; and then you see I'll manage to put him against Father Longwind, and then we will have a treat."

"Would not that be unkind?" said Anna; "perhaps Father Longwind would rather decline an argument."

"Never you fear that, Anna; he's always at it; and besides," said George, dropping his gay smile and tone, "I want to shield you from the attack. Don't I know what's a coming? I hav'nt lived in the world so long for nothing, I hope. But there comes the stage now, and as sure as I'm alive there's Halley too. An't he a splendid fellow?"

The person referred to jumped from the stage and walked with a quick step up the path, his eye wandering over the neatly arranged primroses, tulips, dahlias, etc., skirted with myrtle, violets, and moss, and a fuschia that hung its wealth of crimson blossoms as a window drapery. All these were evidences of a delicate female taste, and his glance was one of warm appreciation.

He was received by his friend George with a hearty shake and a "How are you, my boy?" by Elder Clayton, with the warm salutation, "You are welcome, sir!" by Anna, with a blush and a bow; while Father Longwind extended a glance, with his hand, that measured him, length and breadth, from his head downward. But soon they were all equally interested in his easy flow of conversation and genial good spirits. It was late in the night before the tide of conversation ebbed on the shore of silence, and they individually sought repose.

CHAPTER II.

“’Twixt truth and error there’s this difference known:
Error is fruitful, truth is only *one*.” ———

“Let party names no more
The Christian world o’erspread;
Gentile and Jew, and bond and free,
Are ONE in Christ, their Head.” ———

A MORNING in June! Who can describe the unfolding richness of a June day? No artist can portray it on canvass, though he have more than mortal powers, and the inspiration to catch the mellow gold melting into shade, before which the stars pale, whilst underneath the earth lies, half concealed, spread out like a vision of fairy land. But where are the thousand dew-gems, which hang like so many pearls from every grass-blade, and rustle within the leaves and flowers, with a star in each liquid bosom? Where the thousand songsters, starting from their leafy coverts with a burst of melody that echoes from the overhanging heights? Where the rich, all-pervading consciousness of life, which thrills the soul of the inanimate as well as of the animate world, and finds an answering pulsation in your own? Where the perfumes, which mount up toward heaven like pure incense from a thousand shrines? And where the ever-changing skies, which vary but to put on new

splendor, till the day-king, fairly started on his triumphal march, lifts his burning eye above the hill-tops and bids the world "good-morrow"? Ah! the picture presented by the Divine hand shows a difference from the copy, which is only measured by the line drawn between the finite and the infinite — who can measure it?

Never dawned there a fairer morning than the one which opened to our friends on the morrow of yesternight. The sun's level rays lit up the hill-tops, and stole noiselessly down over woodland and meadow, until the Clayton House was all a-blaze with light; though it tried in vain to penetrate the window-hangings, which were drawn closely last eve, to shut out the darkness. All the windows were closed save one; and this was thrown widely open, and in it, with the sunbeams kindling like a halo of glory around her pale face, was Anna, reading. The open Bible was on her knee, and her eyes were resting on that sublime psalm of David, so beautifully appropriate at such an hour — "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge. There is no speech or language where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun, which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race."

It had been a troubled night to Anna. The incidents of the previous day had disturbed her more than she would confess to other than herself. Hitherto her wants had been met in the rough but kindly natures around her; for they had loved her, and in her own peculiar realm of poetic thought and feeling, she had but dreamed—now had come the time to act. A deep fountain of her soul, which hitherto had not been stirred, was broken up; and, "as deep calleth unto deep," so her soul called for a depth that could measure her own. She could share

many thoughts with George, but there was a "holy of holies" that even he could not enter; and as its solemn depths rolled up, and broke billow against billow, its unsatisfied yearnings called as unceasingly as the voice of the ocean, "My mother! oh, my mother!"

Back in the depths of memory, there was a soft hand, and loving eyes, which looked down deeply within her own soul, and a voice—a tremulous voice there was, that soothed her with its melody,—“Would to God,” said Anna, half audibly, with a deep sigh and starting tears, “Would to God I could feel that hand now upon my throbbing brow, that I could lay my head upon that maternal bosom, and pour out my soul there also, as I would to God! My mother! O my mother! Can you see your sorrowing child—do you know the yearnings of her heart?”

But no mother answered—no mother came. The young soul, trembling in its first bitter life experience, must tread the way alone—no, not alone—thou and thy God, Anna, what need of more!

There came no mother, it is true, but a still small voice whispered to Anna's soul these comforting words, “When thy father and thy mother forsake thee, then the Lord will take thee up. Commit thy way unto the Lord, trust also in Him, and He will bring it to pass.” Close your eyes, rest as securely as an infant in its mother's bosom; wake with the dawn, and go on thy way rejoicing, for I am thy God; in me is your strength, my arm never wearies, my eyes never slumber. That voice, which said to the troubled sea, “Peace, be still!” can only still the waves that lash the soul's deep; and in obedience to that voice, bathed in the sunlight of his glorious smile. Such moments are a foretaste of heaven, and only come when we feel our earthly props giving way under us, and like sinking Peter, cry out, “Lord, save, or I perish!”

Anna was just waking up to the consciousness that she was all alone in the world. True, those with whom she lived, filled the place of parents in outward relations, but she knew enough of human nature to realize that the ties which bound them had not the strength of kindred blood; and whether they would stand the hour of trial, was the question that presented itself in the solemn hour of night, and in which was involved many prayers and tears. She owed them a debt—a deep debt of gratitude, and would it not be right to submit to them in all things, and follow their dictation? Ah! she would gladly do it, were it not that she now recognized a higher authority, and had given up all claims to herself, into the hands of her Savior. He said, “Search the Scriptures, for they testify of me.” It was a personal command, no one could do it for her, and if in searching she should be led to differ—ah! the bare thought was fearful in its uncertainty of results; but “God being my helper, I will be true to my own soul,” she exclaimed, “and O thou great God, guide me into thy truth!”

In that hour of the solemn night-time, no one dreamed that she—the timid, retiring Anna—was determining a point that involved her future through all her natural life, and stretched on into eternity with results that none but God could fathom. No human being was aware of it, but angels were, and they hovered around with untold interest. What joy there must have been in heaven when they bore up her fervent petition and solemn resolve, “God being my helper, I will be true to my own soul; and thou, O God, guide me into thy truth!”

Soft as an angel’s whisper stole these words through her mind, and soothed and strengthened her:

“Hate what God hath written hateful
In great letters on thy soul;
Ever minding to read rightly
Every sign upon the scroll.

Love what Jesus taught thee lovely;
 Cherish all the angels bring;
 Not *affecting* one pulsation
 For the fitness of the thing.

Worship as the Spirit moves thee;
 Wear no gyves upon thy faith.
 When the heavens are open to thee,
 Hear what the Revealer saith.

Thou and God! sublime relation,
 Drifting through eternity,
 Whelming human speculation,
 And merging earthly vanity!"

The sun was now several hours high, as Father Longwind exclaimed for the third or fourth time, "really, I must be going, I must be off, or I shall not get to N—— to-day. It is hard work to go away from you, Brother Clayton! Miss Anna," he said, taking a seat near her, "they tell me that you have found the Lord precious to your soul. I have been wanting to congratulate you on so happy an event: do you find that your enjoyments increase?"

"I think that I find in religion the only true enjoyment on earth," she replied.

"Ah! yes; all else is vanity, 'vanity of vanities,' saith the preacher. Now you must go on, it is a progressive life — step after step to be taken; you have taken one, now the next one is to put on Christ openly before the world. One may not pause after taking the first; but take the second, and the third, and so on to the end of the race." He paused, and looked in her face for a reply, but she was silent, and embarrassed. She felt Halley's eyes fixed on her, and the family were all listening *eagerly* for her response, but it was more the consciousness of the motive that prompted the inquiry, which caused her embarrassment.

"You have read in your Bible," Father Longwind continued,

“that those who believed were baptized. The eunuch said, ‘See, here is water, what doth hinder me?’ Philip replied, ‘If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest.’ He understood his next duty, and was anxious to do it without delay. So in every instance, ‘believe and be baptized’ was the divine command, and it seems to me that it is equally binding on you and me, and every believer on the Lord Jesus Christ. Don’t you think so, Anna?”

“Perhaps it is,” Anna replied, with the flush deepening on her cheek; “but it seems to me, that there might now be a reasonable excuse for delay, which could not possibly exist at that time; in fact, that delay would not only be excusable, but haste criminal.” She paused, confused at her own boldness, in daring to express an opinion which she knew would be disapproved by her listeners. But what can I do? she thought, if I speak at all, it must be what I think to be the truth. After a moment’s hesitation, she continued, “Then, the meaning of every command was distinctly understood in its length and breadth, its application and force. They not only had the personal teachings of Christ, but were divinely endowed to comprehend even the dark and hidden things pertaining to the plan of salvation. And they were familiar with the manners and customs of the people of that age, and their habits of thought. All of these things are modifying circumstances which are to be considered, and will certainly be taken into consideration by our Heavenly Father and Judge. As proof positive that these things are not so clearly understood now, you have but to look around on the Christian world—all Christians believe that they are right, yet they widely differ on many points.”

“Yet if I read my Bible right,” said Father Longwind, “the essentials of the plan of salvation are made so plain, that a wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein.”

“True the *essentials* must be, otherwise God’s revelation

would not be perfect, and God cannot produce an imperfect thing," said Anna.

"And are not the essentials, repentance, faith, and baptism? 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned.'"

"Father Longwind," said Anna, "you must not propound questions to me as you would to a sage. If my mind was satisfied on all these points, I should not be so earnestly inquiring after the truth as I am. I do not feel myself competent to speak on these subjects: I am so young a student of the Gospel. But it seems to me, that of the essentials of salvation, repentance is undoubtedly one; for we read in Matt. iv. 17, that 'from that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand.' It seems that repentance was the burden of his preaching, and faith is everywhere represented as the keystone of salvation. Saith Jesus, in John vi. 47, 'Verily, verily I say unto you, he that believeth on me, hath everlasting life.' I also find that a continuance, or holding out, is represented as essential; for Jesus says, in Matt. x. 22, 'Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake: but he that endureth to the end shall be saved.' But as to baptism, if you refer to water baptism, I have never been able to find the proof in the Word of God."

"But what do you make of this text?" said Father Longwind; "'He that believeth and *is baptized* shall be saved'? Is there not the provision of baptism? There are two provisions only—believing, or faith, and *baptism*?"

Anna hesitated and looked inquiringly at George—his glance said, go on, as plainly as eyes could express it, and she replied: "I think John the Baptist throws some light on that point, when he says, in Mark i. 3, 'I indeed have baptized you with water, but He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.' And Jesus, when assembled with his disciples for the last time before his ascension, said unto them, as recorded in Acts i. 5,

‘For John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.’ Here Christ’s baptism is clearly defined, and contrasted with John’s, as it is in many other passages in the Gospels which I could name. The baptism referred to in this text, is undoubtedly that which regenerates the soul, otherwise why should it be spoken of in connection with the soul’s salvation? As Paul testifies in Ephesians iv. 30, ‘Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption.’ I could not for one moment imagine it to refer to water baptism, which is but a type of the true; as it would thereby be giving an external rite an importance nowhere sanctioned in the Gospel. To believe it, would be to believe that it is a saving ordinance, and not only all Gospel but all church experience proves that to be false. Jesus says in John vi. 63, ‘It is the *Spirit* that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.’”

Father Longwind was becoming more and more surprised at the readiness with which his questions were answered, but affected a little laugh as he replied: “O no, of course we don’t think immersion a saving ordinance, of course not, only *very* important. I always had my doubts about that passage myself. I’ve been rather in the habit of thinking that Christ probably meant both — the thing itself — which is the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and water baptism, which is the image or shadow of the other. Don’t you think so, Brother Clayton?”

“Undoubtedly he did,” Brother Clayton replied. It must be confessed that Elder Clayton never had very clear ideas about these points, and did not know what else to say.

Halley, who had been listening attentively to the conversation, with his eyes wandering over the lawn, resting now on the trees which shook their stalwart branches in the breeze, and then on the grass and flowers, still fresh with the morning dew, and sparkling in the sunshine, smiled at this last idea, and said, pointing to a great oak before them, “I suppose if Brother

Longwind was telling us about that tree, describing to us its value, if used as timber in building a ship to carry our commerce to the four quarters of the earth, that he would not expect us to understand him as meaning both the *tree and its shadow*? I think the shadow would hardly compare with the substance in utility. In fact, that shadow, and all shadows, are of no use whatever, save it be to serve as a type of the substance; and are utterly insignificant and worthless when *separately considered*. Would it not, then, be as unreasonable to suppose that Christ would include both the thing itself and its shadow or type, when speaking of its power to save the soul, as that you would include both the tree and its shadow in building a ship? You would succeed as well in building ships of *oak* shadows, as making Christians of *water* shadows!"

"O yes, yes, yes," said Father Longwind with another laugh, "that seems to be plain enough; but, Miss Anna, you cannot deny that the Apostles strictly enjoined it upon believers; or at least invariably practised it on profession of their faith in Jesus Christ?"

"It seemed to be the act," replied Anna, "through which they made a profession of their faith to the world. Its use was to say to all mankind, We, baptized ones, acknowledge ourselves the followers of Jesus, to have faith in his atonement, and in the sanctifying influences of the Holy Ghost."

"I don't see but what you understand it perfectly well," continued Father Longwind, "I can't see what is in your way, Anna; is it anything about the *mode*?" and he scrutinized her face again for a reply.

Anna would gladly have avoided that point, but the question was asked, and must be answered, and so with much hesitation, she said; "I confess that I am not quite satisfied on that point yet, and am investigating it; I hope soon to arrive at the truth, and then, when I know my duty, and how to perform it, I intend to do it without further delay."

“Yes, yes,” Father Longwind remarked, musingly, drumming in the mean time with his fingers on the window-sill, “Yes, investigation is a very good thing where one has the means to carry it on to any great extent. *Partial* investigation, however, I think, sometimes does more hurt than good. You know the poet says:

“Drink *deep*, or taste not, the Pierian spring.”

“I am never satisfied with partial draughts,” replied Anna, smiling; “though I hardly think it will be required to go beyond the means that I can command. If every one lives up to all the light he can get from the word of God, I think he will be justified.”

“Just so, just so,” responded Father Longwind; “I think perhaps I may be able to assist you a little. I know of some excellent works on this subject; I guess I’ll bring them down on my way back. Yes, yes; this investigatigating spirit is very commendable, I think. But really I must be going, or I shan’t get back to-morrow.” Thus saying, the good man made his bow with a kind adieu, and departed on his way, wondering who had been the teacher in the recent interview.

Mother Clayton had been listening with a degree of interest which was only evinced by the clinking of her knitting-needles; watching for fear there might be a thrust at her favorite creed. She heaved a deep sigh of relief as the conversation ceased, and said that she was glad Father Longwind was going to take the matter in hand, if the thing must be agitated; but for her part, she did not see why they could not let well enough alone. Thus saying, to the great relief of her pent-up thoughts, she went out to attend to her culinary duties, and was soon heard singing, in her own peculiar minor and nasal voice, the familiar hymn,

“A charge to keep I have;”

from which she soon struck off into another, equally familiar:

“Hark! the voice of love and mercy
Sounds aloud from Calvary.”

“Love and mercy!” thought Anna; “Love and mercy! These are the two controlling principles which moved our Savior to offer himself as an atonement for our sins. Oh, what an infinite sacrifice it took to atone for a guilty world! In our stead the eternal Son of God bore the stripes of an angry Father, and by his stripes *we* are healed!” Then arose before her mind that memorable scene when, assembled with his disciples for the last time before his crucifixion, when the bread was broken and the wine drunk, how he said unto them, “He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me. This is my commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you.” And again he said, “I *command* you that ye love one another. After these things he lifted up his eyes to heaven and said, Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son may also glorify thee. I have manifested thy name unto the men thou gavest me out of the world: thine they were, and thou gavest them to me, and they have kept thy word. Neither pray I for these alone, but for those also which shall believe on me through their word. That they may all be *one*, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee: that they may also be ONE in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me.”

“*Oh, how they love one another!*” thought Anna, as her mind ran over the present phase of the Christian world. Could not the prayer of the Infinite Son of God avail at such an hour to keep them *one*? Ah, if they are not *one*, they *must* be! That prayer *must* have its fulfilment—*must* be answered. “For I know that thou hearest me always,” saith Jesus. “Make them ONE, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.”

O thou great God, speed that hour when all thy people shall be *one* in the *truth*, that the unbelieving of this generation rise not up in judgment to condemn us.

CHAPTER III.

“He is a freeman whom the truth makes free,
And all are slaves beside.” —

“Oh, grant us grace, Almighty Lord,
To read and mark thy holy word;
Its truths with meekness to receive,
And by its holy precepts live!” —

“MR. HALLEY,” said Anna, looking up from the book in which she had been absorbed the last two hours, “Mr. Halley, I have found a difficulty in the way which is utterly beyond my power to remove, and I shall be under the necessity of calling on my friends.” This was a few days subsequent to the incidents related in the last chapter; during which time Father Longwind had returned with the promised theological works, one of which Anna was now perusing. “This argument,” she continued, “which would seem candid and fair to the careless reader, assumes, to build on, a position which is a disputed one, not even intimating that it was ever questioned.”

“It is not every one who looks so well after the foundation-stones,” said Halley. “The world takes it for granted that what *seems* fair is fair. But what is your difficulty? If it is in my power to help you, I shall be happy to do so.”

“It is this: here it is assumed that βαπτίζω (*baptizo*), which is the original Greek word that is rendered *baptize* in our translation, means, ‘to dip,’ ‘to plunge,’ ‘to overwhelm,’ and is never used in any of its forms to convey any other meaning

Reference is here made to Greek lexicons, in which it is traced from its root up, and shown in every instance to convey the idea of dipping. This point assumed, it then goes on to build the superstructure on this platform. Now my difficulty is here: no reference is made that would lead me to suppose that this was ever questioned; but I think I have heard that it was; and before I go on, I must have this point settled. For if this platform should be knocked from under, the beautiful superstructure would hang betwixt the heavens and the earth, belonging to neither."

"That's the idea, sis," said George; "but an't it kinder scary business, digging round these old platforms? Seems to me there might be danger of being buried up in the rubbish."

"There is little to be feared from that quarter," said Halley. "If you had ever travelled over the Great Desert, you would probably have seen, rising from its arid sands, trees, fountains, walls, pillars, and dome, with all the real magnificence of a kingly palace — very lovely to gaze upon; but if you had attempted a closer view, the deceitful mirage would have vanished in the air. So it is with many a splendid structure of the human brain: seemingly perfect and complete when viewed in the distance superficially; but commence an investigation of its several parts, and you will find that spire, dome, roof, walls, pillars, and deep foundation-stones, are alike composed of air, reared in air, and ever ready to vanish before every rough breath which may be blown against them — like soap-bubbles which the younger children amuse themselves with. *Truth* harmonizes with all the words and works of God. It is an Eternal Rock, against which dash the ceaseless waves of falsehood and error, but without effect, save to recoil upon themselves. And the combined powers of the elements and forces of the world beating against it, and all the united efforts of the whole human race digging about it with the spade of thought, only reveal more clearly its comely proportions, and its strength and immutability"

“Just so,” said Anna. “Now if this be truth,”—holding up the volume she had been reading,—“it will bear investigation. And now just help me to dig about it, that we may be satisfied whether it be the spurious or the true.”

“I will do so with the greatest of pleasure,” said Halley, “provided it is agreeable to all. If you, George, and Elder Clayton, and mother Clayton, too,” he said, with a smile and a bow to that good lady, in whose good graces he had most successfully worked himself, “if you will take hold of it with me, we will examine it as carefully as we can, and see if it will bear investigation, and the impress of truth, when placed alongside of God’s word—for his word is truth.”

“O, of course we are willing,” said Elder Clayton, “though I don’t pretend to know much about these nice points.”

“Yes, let’s into it,” said George; “I’m getting interested myself. I an’t sure but I shall come out a D. D. yet.”

“I hope you will come out anything but that,” said the mother, glancing with true maternal pride on her handsome boy, with his open-hearted ingenuous expression of countenance.

“Let us have a statement of the first position, then,” said Halley.

“It is,” Anna replied, “as I have already stated, that *baptize*, which in the original is a Greek word, and in the Greek form is βαπτίζω (*baptizo*), invariably means *to dip, to plunge, to overwhelm*. The meaning of the word, as used by Christ and the Apostles, seems to me to be truly the starting-point. If we can determine what the idea was, which was conveyed, when he said, ‘Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;’ then, I think, we shall have found an immutable truth, around which will cluster others.”

“Or rather,” said Elder Clayton, “what that act was, which was performed, when Christ was baptized of John in Jordan.”

“Either one,” said Anna, “though I prefer the command—

the commission with which the disciples were empowered — as it is the only authority I can find in the teachings of Christ, which is at all satisfactory to me.”

“What!” exclaimed Elder Clayton, “is not example better than precept?”

“What evidence would there have been,” said Anna, “of its being for our example, if he had not said, ‘Go ye into all the world, baptizing them.’”

“True,” said Elder Clayton, “but I think the idea is easier to get at, in my text, than in yours.”

“Well, then,” said Anna, “let that be the trial text. I think it is found in Mark i. 9. Here it is, it reads, ‘And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan.’”

“By one party it is understood,” said Halley, “that Jesus was dipped of John in Jordan. Is not that so, Mr. Clayton?”

“It is,” replied the Elder.

“And by the other,” Halley continued, “that John there administered to him the ordinance of baptism. Now for the testimony on the respective sides.”

“What’s that? the *rite* of baptism?” asked Elder Clayton. “I suppose you mean that it was administered by pouring or sprinkling?”

“I mean,” said Halley, smiling, “that Mark records nothing about the *mode* by which it was administered; but simply states that it was administered by John to Jesus.”

“Then you are not an advocate of sprinkling? I thought it could’nt be possible, right in the face and eyes of such testimony!” said the old man with evident relief. “Just listen, ‘Jesus was baptized of John *in* Jordan;’ what could that mean, but that he was immersed in the river of Jordan?”

“We will look at it,” said Halley, “and see what bearing the evidences have on the point in question. I never intend,” he continued, “to advocate anything but what I have good

reason for believing. Whatever there may be elsewhere for sprinkling, it certainly is not to be supported by anything found here; and it remains to be seen if there is anything in favor of dipping."

"I would suggest," said George, "as *baptize* is the disputed word, that we first examine the context wherever it occurs, with reference to the two ideas; that is, of dipping, and of the rite of baptism, before we take up the word itself."

"I was about to suggest the same idea," said Anna; "it seems that there must be sufficient evidence in the Bible alone. I always feel sure that what I find there, there can be no mistake about."

"I am not particular, as it regards the process by which the investigation is to be made," said Halley, "provided we get the evidences where we can look at them as a *whole*. The one great cause of the divisions and strifes that are now, and ever have been, agitating the Christian world, arises simply from the false and circumscribed manner of studying the word of God. For example, take the different views on the Divinity of Christ. One reads, where it says, 'the *Man Christ Jesus*;' and forthwith he concludes that he *is* a mere man—a good man to be sure—but only a man, nevertheless, and boldly points to God's truth for his testimony. Another finds a passage where he is spoken of as Creator—as being with God, and as being God—and thereupon builds a theory on the other extreme, making him altogether Divinity; and to make that seem consistent and plausible, deifies his mother, too. But others with more extended and enlightened views, gather *all* the testimony, and viewing it as a *whole*, find truth—the truth—on the middle ground, the union of the human and divine, a God-man."

"Is not that the proper way to study anything?" asked Anna.

"Certainly it is," he replied. "It is a universal principle in obtaining correct knowledge of any subject whatever. And

especially is this important, where there is involved a knowledge of spiritual; or perhaps a blending of the spiritual and material."

"But it seems to me," said Elder Clayton, "that we are wandering; I am anxious to get at the investigation."

"We are only discussing the principles on which to investigate," said Anna. "It is necessary that we should understand them, in order to rightly understand each other; and also to get them plainly in sight, or we may not get the right road."

"And it is equally necessary that we should keep them in sight," said Halley; "or we may lose the way even after starting right. In the first place, as has been suggested, we are to examine the context wherever the disputed word occurs, with reference to the two ideas, that is, of *dipping*, and the rite of baptism. In Matthew, third chapter, it is first found. I will turn to it and read it, supplying the word *dipped* for baptized. 'In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. For this is he of whom it is spoken by the prophet Esaias, saying: The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye, the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. And the same John had his raiment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins, and his meat was locusts and wild honey. There went out to him all Jerusalem and Judea, and all the region round about Jordan; and were *dipped* of him in Jordan, confessing their sins. But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his *dipping*, he said unto them, O ye generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth, therefore, fruits meet for repentance, and think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham for our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees; therefore, every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit, is

hewn down, and cast into the fire. I indeed *dip* you *with* water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me, is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall *dip* you *with* the Holy Ghost, and with fire. Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire. Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan, unto John, to be *dipped* of him. But John forbade him, saying, I have need to be *dipped* of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering, said unto him, Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness. And he suffered him. And Jesus, when he was *dipped*, went up straightway out of the water; and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him; and, lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.'

“This is Matthew’s testimony; and let me ask you if *dipping* fills the idea in connection with preaching repentance and the coming in of the kingdom of God? Was the *end* dipping? Imagine for a moment that John preached in the wilderness, calling the people a generation of vipers, and warning them to flee from the wrath to come, *for the sole purpose of dipping them in the river Jordan!* In a moment it assumes a ridiculous as well as an inconsistent aspect! And yet it is here and everywhere else enforced that baptism was the mission of John. We will call for his own testimony. John i. 31: ‘I knew him not, but that he should be made manifest to Israel; *therefore am I come baptizing with water.*’ And in the 33d verse, ‘I know him not; *but he that sent me to baptize with water,* the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.’ Here he has himself defined the object of his own mission; and he probably understood as well as any one, except Him who gave it to him, what that mission was.

“Christ says, ‘*The baptism of John, whence was it?*’ He was also said ‘*to preach baptism.*’ Then who will affirm that it was not the *one* thing for which he was sent? His preaching was but the *means* to the *end* or *object* of baptism.”

“But it seems to me,” said George, “that *dipping* sounds as well as *sprinkling* or *pouring*; but *all* of them, in the passages you read, are simply ridiculous.”

“So they are,” said Halley; “that is what I have been showing, and that is just what we believe.”

“Are you trying to make out,” said Elder Clayton, “that there wa’nt anything done because it looks ridiculous?”

“No, sir; not at all. I simply make out that God always has in his ordinances, and in all his dealings with men, a deep *spiritual significance*, which is the *true* lesson to be enforced, or the *true* end to be gained. There is not an ordinance in the law of God as delivered unto Moses, or in the law of Christ—in the gospels, in the New Testament—but what has a spiritual signification; is simply a *type* of something spiritual. Hence if we lose sight of the *spiritual* import, it becomes a dead letter—a worse than useless thing.”

“Then you would have us understand,” said Anna, “that the *true* end of John’s baptism was not the *act* performed by him, but the spiritual thing which it symbolized?”

“Precisely, Miss Anna; and the reason why this is so hard to be understood, is because we are sensuous beings, and take sensuous views of things. Our senses are caught with the outward form; while the truth is—the spiritual is far more real than the material. ‘Mind is more real than body, life more real than form, God more real than the tangible universe.’ To teach us this lesson, God has instituted *material* ordinances as *shadows of spiritual substances.*”

“O that is a beautiful thought!” exclaimed Anna. “It pours a flood of light on my mind with regard to God’s dealings with men. I *know* it is the *truth*, for it immediately re-

commends itself to reason and the understanding; and further, it has on it the impress of Infinite Wisdom!"

"There is an abundance of evidence to prove it," said Halley; "but we will not dwell upon it now, as it will come up again as we proceed."

"I can't see," said Elder Clayton, "how this materially affects the question. It is reasonable to suppose, that the act was dipping, and that it may have a spiritual import too—it's likely it did."

"Then you concede," replied Halley, "that John's mission was not the *act* performed with water, which could only be the 'purifying of the flesh,' as Paul has said; but as he warned them to flee from the wrath to come, which was to come in a spiritual state of existence, and preached the coming of the kingdom of God, which was a spiritual kingdom; for Jesus says, 'My kingdom is not of this world;' that the *essential* part of his baptism must have been, then, *spiritual* also; that is, of a spiritual import? If not, it follows that he baptized solely for the purpose of putting off the filth of the flesh—for cleansing their bodies! Which of these two ideas is most consistent with a heavenly mission, no one can be at a loss to determine. How this bears upon the question now before us, will be more evident by and by. Now let us turn to Matt. iii. 11, 'I indeed baptize you with water, unto repentance; but He that cometh after me, is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.' We gather from this, that what John was doing with water, Christ would also do with the Holy Ghost."

"We can't suppose," said Elder Clayton, "that Christ would *literally* baptize with the Holy Ghost, that is, not in the form of baptism."

"Yes, *literally*," replied Halley. "John says, 'What I do with water, that shall He do with the Holy Ghost.' The only difference implied in the phraseology, is this: in one case the

agent and object are material; and in the other case, the agent and object are spiritual. That which John was doing with water to the bodies of his disciples, the same would Christ do with the Holy Ghost to the spirits of his disciples. And it is to be inferred that John was doing this to material objects with material means, *because* Christ would therefore do the same to spiritual objects with spiritual means. Now things which are said to be alike, must resemble each other either in *form*, operation or effect: otherwise they cannot be said to be alike. Then John's baptism must be like Christ's in one of these points. Let us look again at this verse, and try to find out the point of resemblance which will justify John in saying, that he is doing with material substance, what Christ will do with spiritual substance. It reads, 'He that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear, He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.' This shows that John considered Christ's mission far superior to his own, and that determines one point in this question. For it is an axiom in mathematics—a self-evident truth—that things which are equal to the same things, are equal to each other; and negatively, that those things which are not equal to each other, are not equal to the same things. Consequently, if John's mission was not equal to Christ's, as he testifies, then they could not be equal or alike in the effects produced. Now is there any resemblance in their operation? Elder Clayton, can you tell me what the office work of the Spirit is on the souls of men?"

"It is generally considered," he answered, "a regenerator—a sanctifier."

"A sealer, too," said Anna. "Paul says, 'Grieve not the Holy Spirit by which ye are sealed unto the day of redemption.'"

"That is rather an effect," replied Halley; "and so here we have before us in one view, the effect and the operation of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Its operation is to purify and

sanctify; and its effect to seal the soul unto the day of redemption. You can see at once there is, nor can be, no parallel *here* between the two baptisms. No enlightened Christian now-a-days claims for water baptism any sanctifying grace, or that it has the effect to save the soul. In Christ's chosen twelve, there was one Judas, and if the rest were baptized, so was he; but be that as it may, they were all sent out to preach, and had bestowed on them *all* miraculous powers of healing; and yet that did not make him one whit better or purer. I must quote again your text, Anna, in the words of Jesus, 'It is the *Spirit* that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.'

"I have found an example to the point," said Anna. "It is in Acts, 8th chapter, beginning with the 13th verse. I will read it: 'Then Simon himself believed also; and when he was baptized, he continued with Philip, and wondered, beholding the miracles and signs which were done. Now when the Apostles, which were at Jerusalem, heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John; who, when they came down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost (for as yet he was fallen on none of them, only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus). Then they laid their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost. And when Simon saw that through the laying on of the Apostles' hands, the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money. But Peter said unto him, Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money. Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter, for thy heart is not right in the sight of God. Repent, therefore, of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee: for I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness, and bond of iniquity.'

"Evidence so direct and unmistakable needs no comment," said Halley. "There is but one more point to examine, and

that in truth needs nothing but the simple testimony of John. He says that what he was doing, that would Christ also do; and we have shown from Scripture proof, that in operation and effect, they must of necessity be utterly unlike. Then it follows, if there is no resemblance in *form*, John utters that which is not true. He was doing one thing, and Christ would do something altogether different. Who will take upon himself the responsibility of giving John the lie! I for one dare not, for Jesus says, 'Verily, I say unto you, among them that are born of women, there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist.' But do you ask how things can be alike in form, and utterly unlike in value and use? I am sure we have every day examples of this. I have seen an exact imitation of a gold dollar—perfectly like one in form—resembling it in size, color and stamp, and yet it was not gold. And, Anna, I have seen wax flowers so perfect, that the eye could not determine the real from the copy. Yet they were not one in substance or value. Still, the wax flowers were a perfect type of the real flowers—and the bogus dollar of the real dollar. Now, Anna, what, the truth of which there can be no question, have we found by an examination of this chapter?"

"It is," she replied: "that John declared that what he was doing with water, the same would Christ do with the Spirit. And by further examination we found that the resemblance was neither in the operation nor the effect, and therefore it must of necessity be in the *form* of the rite."

"Please note that down," said Halley, "as a *point determined* in this investigation, *as a truth*; and it remains to be seen if others will not cluster around it speedily—truths bearing witness to this truth, and corroborating it."

"I have done so," said Anna; "but it occurs to me that here is something to throw light on the form or mode of baptism. 'They were baptized *in* Jordan, and Jesus went up straightway *out* of the water.'"

“What does it indicate?” said Halley.

“That they went down *into* the water,” she replied.

“Is that positive evidence of form?” asked Halley.

“No, it only indicates that it was more conveniently done by going down into the water.”

“Very well, then, we will consider it for what it is worth by and by; for it does not properly come up here. Is there any more testimony to be deduced from this chapter, except what is found in the disputed word?” he asked.

“I cannot see as there is,” Anna replied: “but there is a query in my mind about the position already taken. I always thought immersion to be in likeness of Christ’s death and burial; but I cannot now trace the connection, if water baptism is a type of spirit baptism, as it seems most clearly to be.”

“I presume you are not the first one,” said Halley, “who has believed it without knowing a reason why?”

“But immersion *is* in likeness of the death and burial of Christ,” said Elder Clayton, rather warmly; “as he was buried up in the earth, so the believer is buried under the baptismal waters. It always looked as solemn as a literal death and burial to me. You know Paul says: ‘Buried with him in baptism.’”

“*By* baptism,” said Halley. “Suffer me to correct you: a small word sometimes changes materially the significance of a sentence. Why, Elder, you almost tempt me to omit, for the present, the intervening texts, to show you what a broken reed you lean upon; but we will come to it in time.”

“I don’t believe you can make that mean anything else,” said Elder Clayton. “It is just as plain to my mind as that twice two makes four. There are other passages, too. I know it can be made out very plain, that immersion is in likeness of the death and burial of Jesus Christ. You know I said I was’nt posted on these subjects, but Brother Burton is coming in a few days, to stay over the Sabbath; he has all these texts

on his tongue's end. Perhaps we had better wait until he comes."

"I don't see why we need to wait," said Anna; "I am not going to believe anything but what I find in the Bible; and if that is here, we can find it as well as Brother Burton. Besides, such young students as George and I, who have never been over the ground before, must needs be led slowly. We won't have made any great progress; and when Brother Burton comes, then he can assist us."

"What pleaders the ladies are," said Halley. "Did they ever undertake a case, and not sweep all opposition before them? Then, if we are all agreed, suppose we meet out on the shady end of the balcony this afternoon, to make further progress."

"Just look here!" exclaimed mother Clayton, holding up and measuring off full two fingers of knitting-work. "Look here. I believe I've accomplished more than any of you; for such a jumble of John and Matthew I never heard before; I could'n't make anything of it, nor did'n't try to!"

"Every one to his calling!" said George; "you to yours—we to ours, and I to mine; come, Halley, let's go down town before dinner, or my blood will stagnate."

To Anna there was opening a new field of thought. She had never attempted to trace the connection or consistency of Gospel principles; and she wondered how, how she could have neglected, so long, so delightful a field for investigation. If we look out on the universe, she thought, all there is harmony and consistency, a beautiful index of the divine mind. The same principle, that holds a drop of dew suspended from a grass blade, controls worlds and systems of worlds, wheeling with impetuous velocity around their central suns, and whirls them, too, in turn, around some central point, in immense circles, a wheel within a wheel, until the finite is lost in the infinite. This gives us some idea of the wisdom and power of the God-head. But the Bible is from the same author, and is given to

us to reveal other attributes of his character which run parallel with those displayed in his works of creation and providence, and which must move as harmoniously in their operations and effects; otherwise, he would not be a God of infinite perfection — as he declares himself to be, both in his word and works — one perfect whole.

CHAPTER IV.

“’Tis great, ’tis manly to disdain disguise;
It shows our spirit, or it proves our strength.” —

“The Lord shall make us know
The secrets of his heart,
The wonders of his covenant show,
And all his love impart.
The dealings of his hand
Are truth and mercy still,
With such as to his covenant stand,
And love to do his will.” —

THE afternoon finds our friends comfortably seated in the balcony, with a fresh breeze that started up about midday, shaking the pendent honeysuckles over and around them. But the circle was not complete. Mother Clayton excused herself with the plea that a press of household duties detained her, and wondered if the Elder had forgotten to prepare his sermon for the Sabbath. It was well enough for the young folks to spend their time in that way, but she was sure it looked foolish for people of her age and of the Elder’s, who were established in the faith, to trouble themselves about such matters. Elder Clayton was evidently of another mind. He had been consult-

ing the Concordance, and appeared with his Bible under his arm, anticipating an easy victory.

“The next chapter,” said Halley, “where Matthew employs the word *baptism*, is the 20th, 22–23 verses, where it is stated that the mother of Zebedee’s children asked of Jesus, that her two sons might sit, the one on his right hand, and the other on his left, in his kingdom. And Jesus answered her, ‘Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? They say unto him, We are able. And he saith unto them, Ye shall drink, indeed, of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with; but to sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father.’ This is,” continued Halley, “very generally supposed to be a baptism of suffering to which he refers, but I must beg leave to differ. Let us examine it: ‘Are ye able to drink of the cup that I *shall* drink of?’ This cup was yet to come, and you will find that the Savior refers to it again in the agony of the garden, when he says: ‘If it be possible, let this cup pass from me.’ That was indeed a cup of suffering. And further, he says: ‘To be baptized with the baptism that I *am* baptized with;’ this act was *passed* with him, not to come. Matthew had recorded his baptism of water and of the Holy Ghost, that descended and rested on him in the form of a dove. Then let me ask you if you find any indication of a baptism of suffering here? Some have argued that he *was to be* overwhelmed with sufferings, and that this he looks forward to, and calls baptism—but where do they find it? There is certainly no such thing here, and it remains to be seen if they can find it elsewhere. He refers to a *baptism already past*; and whether it be of water or of spirit, you can form some idea by his asking if they are *able* to be thus baptized. And in the next verse he tells them, that they shall be baptized with his baptism—they had

in all probability already received the baptism of *water*, but not Christ's baptism—but when afterward the Holy Ghost fell on them, then they were baptized with our Savior's baptism; and they, not long thereafter, partook of his cup of suffering; for, like him, they were persecuted and put to death. Is not this so, Elder Clayton?"

"Really," said the Elder, looking hard at the passage, and around it, for something to change its appearance and force, "it must be I've read this passage carelessly, as I always thought it to be plainly a baptism of suffering. Indeed, I believe it is thus marked in my Concordance."

"Very likely it is," said Halley; "but you see it is not so marked here in the Bible."

"A query arises," said Anna; "you said that Matthew had recorded his baptism of water, and also of the Holy Ghost which descended upon him in the form of a dove; and we have found that the work of the Spirit is to cleanse and sanctify; but he was without sin. I do not see the consistency."

"Your objection holds as good against one kind of baptism as the other," responded Halley. "If he had no need of the substance, why should he take upon himself the shadow? For an example, you might answer that he was baptized, for the same reason that the Spirit descended at that particular time; that is, to indicate to John who he was, or quite reasonably, that the Spirit *then* descended to show its *connection with the type*. But if we turn to John i. 33, we will learn that the bodily representation of the Spirit was for a *sign* unto John; 'And I knew him not, but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining upon him, the same is he that baptizeth with the Holy Ghost; and I saw and bare record.' Some might say that it only *seemed* to fall; but that would have been a deception inconsistent with the character of God. That it *really* fell, is proved, or reasserted and corroborated by what

follows: 'And Jesus *being full of the Holy Ghost*, returned from Jordan, and was *led by the Spirit* into the wilderness; not to work *on* him a cleansing and sanctifying process, but *with* him for the salvation of the world. It was not enough for Jesus to die — true, he made full expiation for sin by so doing — but the world was to be convinced by it that he was their Savior, and had made reconciliation possible. Saith Jesus, 'The *Spirit* shall reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment;' and again, 'He shall guide you into all truth;' and we are taught elsewhere, that through the Holy Spirit we are sanctified and sealed; and so you see the work of the Spirit is just as important to fallen humanity in the economy and great plan of redemption, as the sufferings and death of Christ. Our Savior himself says: 'Unless ye are born again, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of God.'"

"O, I see!" exclaimed Anna; "it was to be through a *united* effort that the work was to be accomplished; and this is simply a record of *how* and *when* the Spirit came down to begin the work with Christ. It fell on him really and visibly, and he afterward communicated it to his disciples. Here is the text. John xx. 22; 'And when he said this, he breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost.'"

"In Mark i. 30," said Halley, "Jesus asks the question, 'The baptism of John, was it from heaven or of men? Answer me.'"

"Had I been there," said George, quickly, "I would have answered that if it was simply for the purpose of *wetting them*, it was quite evident to *me* where it came from."

"The word occurs," continued Halley; "but once more in Matthew. You will find it in the 28th chapter and 19th verse, 'Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' This, I believe, is claimed by all as the commission of their Lord; but as the context throws no light on the form, we will pass it over for the present. Next in order is the testimony of

Mark. He repeats faithfully the words of Matthew, 'I have indeed baptized you with water, but He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.' And Mark x. 38-39, we have a repetition of what Matthew says about the cup of suffering, and the baptism of the Holy Ghost; and Mark xi. 30, the question as to the baptism of John, whether of heaven or of men? And John xvi. 15, there is a repetition of the commission, though in a somewhat different form. It reads, 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature;' and in the 19th verse, as the effects of the preaching, and what further was to be done, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.' We have already found what baptism is referred to here, which has the power to *seal* the soul unto redemption."

"I would like to read it," said Anna; "and supply the word immersed. If baptism always means immerse, it means it here: 'He that believeth and is immersed shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.' *Could that mean dipped or immersed in water?*"

"Do you believe it does, Elder Clayton?" said Halley.

"We don't believe that a person *must* be dipped or immersed in water to be saved," responded Elder Clayton. "O, no, of course we don't believe any such thing. There are infants, they never are immersed, and don't need to be; and I suppose others are saved, too, who have never been immersed. O, no, we don't believe that!"

"Then there must be *one* place where baptize does not mean immerse," said Halley; "and I never heard a *sensible* person claim that there was any *dipping with the Holy Ghost!* I have always heard that the *dipping* was in likeness of the burial of Jesus Christ!"

"So it is," responded Elder Clayton. "You know I told you I was'nt posted on these points, and so you must wait until Brother Burton comes, and he will clear it all up I am sure."

“This, then,” said Halley, “ends the testimony of Mark. Luke is next in order. His testimony of John’s baptism, and the Holy Ghost baptism, is essentially the same as that of Matthew and Mark, nor does he throw any new light on the subject. In Luke xii. 50, we have a new text in part, which reads, ‘I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened until it be accomplished.’”

“I thought,” said Elder Clayton; “that there was a baptism of suffering, somewhere, and here it is.”

“We will read in its connection,” said Halley; “and see if it will bear that construction. ‘I am come to send fire on the earth, and what will I, if it be already kindled? But I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened until it be accomplished. Suppose ye that I am come to bring peace on earth? I tell you, nay, but divisions. For, from henceforth, there shall be five in one house, divided three against two, and two against three. The father shall be divided against the son,’ and so on. Now what is Christ talking about? Anna, you have been studying this passage attentively, can you tell us?”

“It seems to be,” she replied: “the *effects* of the Gospel in the earth, how they shall be divided, one against another; and I’m sure this has been literally fulfilled.”

“Fire and sword,” said Halley; “are always figures of strife, divisions and persecutions. Christ did not literally bring these, but they arose from opposition to his Gospel in the hearts of men. When God’s truth comes in contact with error and sin, there must needs be a clashing of the two, as they cannot dwell together. ‘And what will I, if it be already kindled?’ Already the contest between light and darkness had commenced. The great Light of the world had come into it, but the world hated him, and would not receive his word, nor the evidence of his mission. He cast his omniscient eye down along the shores of time, and saw the lighted fagot, the reeking sword

greedy for massacre, death and extermination, and all the horrors — the untold miseries through which the truth would struggle on, until it should gain the ascendancy, and cover the face of the whole earth. Truly he exclaimed, ‘I am come to send fire on the earth, and what will I, if it be already kindled? But before this can come to pass, I have a mission to fulfill, I must still continue to heal the sick, and cleanse the leper, for a testimony of the truth; and soon must suffer, die, rise again, and ascend to my Father, to accomplish that whereunto I am sent. Then I will reign until all enemies are put under my feet.’”

“You would infer,” said Anna; “that baptism there comprehends more than his sufferings?”

“Sufferings alone, do not, by any means, to my mind, *fill* the idea in the connection,” said Halley. “He is speaking of the effects of his Gospel, and the atonement which he has made, on the world; and although his sufferings are an important part, yet nothing he did was unimportant; any part left out, would have made it incomplete. I judge, then, as he was speaking of its effects *as a whole* upon the world, that he certainly referred to it here *as a whole*, when he said, ‘Now am I straitened till it be accomplished.’ I understand this baptism to mean his mission, through which he established his kingdom, and would effect his end — which end was the world’s salvation.”

“This view,” said Anna; “gives it both force and consistency. This view will not conflict with Matthew’s statement, as it was through the agency of the Holy Spirit also, that this was to be brought about. I never could comprehend how a God, though clad with the senses and feelings of a man, would speak, in view of *mere* suffering for a short season, with more feeling and greater shrinking from it, than men often do, than thousands of his followers — the holy martyrs — have done. But I can readily conceive how, when his eye took in the *whole* view, all the importance and bearing of man’s redemption in

the economy of Jehovah's plan; and that to accomplish it, he must struggle hand to hand with death, conquer hell, burst the bands of the grave asunder, and rise, triumphant over all, up to the bosom of his Father. I can readily conceive how he might well exclaim, 'How am I straitened until it be accomplished!' In doing this, he was doing the work of a God — none but God could accomplish such a mission; but human nature, weak as it is, can *suffer* even to death, and still not complain."

"It seems to me," said Elder Clayton; "that this text is a *little ambiguous* in its meaning; at least I don't know as I can explain it, so as to make it more reasonable than the view you have taken of it."

"This, then, ends the testimony of Luke," said Halley. "In the first chapter of John, the same history of John the Baptist is given. But in John iii. 22-26, we have another new text on this subject. 'After these things, came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea, and there he tarried with them and baptized. And John was also baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there; and they came and were baptized: for John was not yet cast into prison. Then there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews, about purifying. And they came unto John, and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bearest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to him.'"

"Here is an important truth!" exclaimed Anna. "As many times as I have read this chapter, my attention was never called to it before. We have found by a course of reasoning, and plain and direct inference, that water baptism has a spiritual import. What that spiritual significance is, we have also discovered. But here is indisputable testimony, directly to the point, 'Then there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews, about *purifying*. And the same came

unto John, and said, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, the same baptizeth, and all men come unto him.' The dispute was about *purifying*, and that purifying was *baptism*, symbolized by water baptism."

"If it was a purifying of the flesh," said George; "then it follows that John was a *public washer*! And if John was only a public washer, then of what importance must have been this mission of his from heaven?"

"Your alternative is a true one," said Halley; "but I think few would like to choose that horn of the dilemma. The Jews," he continued, "were familiar with all the ideas of purifying. Those who discussed this question, were Jews; and their rites were divided into two great classes—those which were significant of purification, and those signifying an atonement for sin. Their many sacrifices perpetually bleeding and smoking on their altars, pointed them forward most forcibly to the great sacrifice which was to be made once for all; and when they observed their rites for purification, they were taught the necessity of their souls being clean and free from sin, that thereby they might be made acceptable worshippers before God. Many a Jew overlooked this, and trusted to the external ordinance, and by so doing lost his birthright. Paul told them that the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, could not do more than purify the flesh, they were mere emblems of a higher and spiritual purification. See Heb. ix. 23, 'It was therefore necessary that the *patterns of things in the heavens* should be purified with these (referring to these sacrifices), but the *heavenly things themselves* with better sacrifices than these,'—which sacrifice was Christ. Under the new dispensation, we have two ordinances comprehending the meaning of the Mosaic ritual—the old dispensation. The Lord's Supper points us most feelingly back to that great atonement which *has been* made for our souls, in the same manner as the many sacrifices of the Jews pointed them forward to the

same great atonement which *would be made* for their souls. Baptism points us to the Holy Spirit's influence, through which we are cleansed, made pure, and fitted for the companionship of holy beings in heaven, as the washings and sprinklings of the Jews pointed them to the same. God's people are *one* at all ages of the world. Not one jot or tittle of God's law ever has or ever will change; for it is founded on principles as eternal as God himself. As a sovereign, he has reserved to himself the perfect right to change the external rites or forms, through which these external principles are revealed to the minds of men, whenever it seemeth to him good. But the principles themselves are a part of God, and cannot be changed unless God himself ceases to be. He has never yet saved a soul from Adam down to this hour, except through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ; and never will, except through faith in him until the end of time."

"What a beautiful and wonderful system is this!" exclaimed Anna; her eyes fixed and dilating as though looking at something in the distance intensely interesting. Before the retina of her mind, was the Savior lifted up on the Cross, as the serpent was lifted up in the wilderness; and over him the inscription in letters of living gold, "LOOK AND LIVE," and around him were the millions of the congregated world; and behold all to whom were given eyes of faith, saw him as clearly in the future as in the past. Glorious sight! Very like to that, we may suppose, which will burst upon our astonished vision in heaven! Half unconsciously, Anna repeated these lines:

"There *saints of all ages* in harmony meet,
Their Savior and brethren transported to greet;
While anthems of pleasure unceasingly roll,
And the smile of the Lord is the feast of the soul."

"Yes," said Halley, his eye moistening by memories awakened by these beautiful lines, "Yes, all are one in Christ Jesus. 'There is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male

nor female, but all are Christ's, and Christ's is God's.' But to resume our investigation. In Acts there are numerous examples of water baptism, and Spirit baptism, showing that they were associated together to some extent, in the minds of the Apostles. Acts x. 44 and 47, 'While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. And Peter said, Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost, as well as we?'"

"They are not said to have been baptized with the Holy Ghost," said Elder Clayton; "it speaks of being baptized with water."

"It says the Holy Ghost fell on them," said Halley. "Now turn to the next chapter, Acts xi. 15 and 16: Peter is here accused by the brethren at Jerusalem, of going in to men uncircumcised, and he gave them an account of the matter. In these verses is a repetition of their baptism. 'And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how he said, John truly baptized with water, but ye shall *be baptized with the Holy Ghost.*' Does he not call the falling of the Holy Ghost upon them, a baptism?"

"Most certainly he does," said Anna, "and not only that, but their receiving the Spirit baptism was considered a sufficient warrant, and used as an argument why they should have the water baptism bestowed on them. God bestowed the inward seal, and how could Peter refuse the outward?"

"There is much more to this effect," said Halley, "in Acts; but why should we heap proof upon proof? We have proved that John baptized with water *because* Christ should thereafter baptize with the Spirit—he says, 'Therefore am I come baptizing with water,' and now we have proved that his prophecy was *literally* fulfilled; and, to save time, we will pass over for the present, the remaining texts in Acts, and proceed to the consideration of Romans."

“I am trying to recall,” said Anna, “the truths we have already found in the Word of God. They are that the mission of John was to evince to the world the coming of the two Divine Powers who were to unite their efforts in man’s salvation—the Atoning and the Sanctifying Powers. He preached the Coming of Jesus, and through him the bestowal of that Divine Spirit, of whose purifying influences his baptism was the type or shadow. We have also found that Christ did personally bestow this Spirit on his disciples, when he breathed upon them after he had risen from the dead: and afterward the Holy Spirit fell on all them that believed on the day of Pentecost, and thereafter also on those who faithfully attended the preaching of the Word, both of the Jews and of the Gentiles.”

“Who is that?” said George, pointing down the way towards a horse and carriage which were coming leisurely up the road, and in which were two men; one of them seemed to be calling the attention of his fellow to the broad acres of meadow and grain upon the one side, and to the neat, comfortable house upon the other.

“That?” said Elder Clayton, with an eager start, his eye lighting up with hope and joy; “Why that is Brother Burton’s carriage, and Father Longwind is with him too! I’m right glad they’ve come just now, before we proceed any farther with our investigations. I think, Mr. Halley, you will have to give up Romans to our side of the question.”

“I will do so willingly, if you can prove your right to it,” replied Hadley.

“O yes; well, I think that will be quite an easy task,” responded the warm-hearted man, advancing to greet his clerical friends.

Brother Burton was a quick-sighted, energetic little man, in every respect, both mentally and physically the antipode of Father Longwind, with whom we have formed a slight acquaintance. He stepped briskly on in the advance of his friend’s

portly figure, and gave his greeting with the air of one who had more important business on his mind than the seeking of a good dinner.

“Now sharpen your weapons,” said George to Halley, with a droll look on his face, “for yonder is the great expounder of the law and the Gospel, than whom, there is no greater in these parts. He has the greatest facility of jumping conclusions, and of evading arguments, possible; and his faculty in this department beats that of any man I ever saw.”

“But truths have sharp corners, which are not so easily gotten over,” said Halley.

“Whoever cannot prove his position from the word of God,” Anna remarked, thoughtfully, “the Word must slay him. You know Paul says: ‘The word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of the soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.’ I cannot imagine how any one would dare to twist or pervert God’s holy truth to suit his own narrow views of things. When there is a ‘Thus saith the Lord,’ man should drop his creeds, and reverently obey.”

“If, then, Brother Burton makes out that John’s baptism was *dipping* in the river Jordan, said George, “I suppose you must be *dipped* also?”

“Certainly,” replied Anna, “if he can prove that to be so, I shall feel it to be my duty to submit to the same act, specified in the word of God, and sanctified by the example of our blessed Savior—if I can find out what that act was.”

“Many of the evidences on these controverted points,” said Halley, “are almost unknown among the masses. People are born—or very early in life have instilled into their minds, certain sectarian prejudices, impressed into their *very natures* from their earliest being, so that all their after education, at least with most of them, seems but to make those impressions

deeper. Many people are monomaniacs in their religious faith; they might read their Bibles all their lives, as many of them do, seeing nothing, and comprehending nothing but what they twist to the support of their peculiar creed. They are self-determined not to comprehend it, if it will not admit of a twisting—many persons I have talked with, good reasoners on other subjects, who could not, or would not, reason at all on their religious principles; neither could they perceive the absurdity or consistency of points at issue. The moment they stepped on the ground of their religious faith, all was confusion and excitement—they were born and educated *so and so*, and so and so they must die.”

“I do not desire to be one of that class,” said Anna. “I desire to be ever ready, with Peter, to give an answer to every one that asketh me; a *reason* of the hope that is in me, with meekness and fear: assured that God never does anything without a *reason* for so doing, and never requires us to do anything without making the *reason of it* apparent, even as a foundation on which to build our faith, dealing with us as intelligent, reasoning and responsible beings. It has been a vexed question with me, how there are so many conflicting *faiths*, all drawn from the Word of God. From what I can learn of His character as revealed in the material universe, I should not suppose that in his revealed will there could be any clashing of principles.”

“Study his word as you would any other book with which you wish to become acquainted,” said Halley; “not to bend *it* to creeds, but to bend *creeds* to it; reason upon it as you would upon a mathematical problem—tracing all the resemblances—resting assured it will bear the test; and see as you become familiar with it, if it is not as harmonious in all its developments, as this universe teeming with worlds, and this world teeming with objects of interest.”

“I know it is,” said Anna; “I know it must be. Can a

perfect Being produce an imperfect thing? No, never. The difficulty must be in the comprehension of man, though not *necessarily*; for God, who well knew his capacities of comprehension, adapted his revelation to suit those capacities, and all the circumstances in which he should ever be involved, thus leaving him without excuse. May God help us rightly to comprehend his word, and his truth!"

CHAPTER V.

"Men may live fools, but fools they cannot die." —

"Truth, crushed to earth, shall rise again,
The eternal years of God are hers;
But Error, wounded, writhes with pain,
And dies among his worshippers."

WITHIN a mile of the Clayton house, over the hill, in a quiet nook, was a humble cottage, in which lived a poor widow and an only child.

The widow supported herself by cultivating the little garden plat around the house, and by such chance bits of sewing as she could pick up in the country around.

At the best it was a precarious subsistence; and had it not been for the care and kindness of a friend, she must have often suffered for the necessities of life. By the mysterious dealings of an over-ruling Providence, who generally orders misfortunes to come not single-handed, she had been, in one short month, stripped of property, widowed — and made childless almost — there was only left one drooping — dying bud of care — not of

promise. Two children she had seen placed by the side of her husband underneath the sod; and the remaining one was spared her for a time, to be not a help in her helplessness, but a burden. The malignant fever which swept the others away, left this sorrowing one a cripple, and as dependent on his mother's care, as when a babe at her bosom.

Crushed and despairing, she wandered away from the scene of her deep misfortunes, and for a number of years, had lived in this humble cottage, living solely to minister to the wants of her child, and because the "Lord will," she always added, with a look of marked resignation toward heaven. The Lord loveth whom he chasteneth. This may have been the reason why his rod was laid so heavily on her; but as gold is tried in the fire, so she came out from under her afflictions, bright and shining as the purest metal. It was from her that Anna first received those deep religious impressions which gave her no rest, until she found it at her Savior's feet. When she began to be troubled with her sense of guilt, and unreconciled state of heart toward God, she came to widow Giles with her doubts and fears. The widow kindly took her by the hand, and led her out into the garden, and there with the solemn twilight around them, and the stars peering down through the grey above them, she laid the case before her Father and her God—pleading his promises—the Lord has promised, and will he not fulfill? "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I *will* give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye *shall* find rest to your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light. Whatsoever ye ask believing, ye receive it, it *shall* be done unto you;" and like an indulgent Father and a merciful God, he remembered his word, and spoke peace to the troubled soul. Ever since that hour, that place had been a consecrated one to Anna, and the widow Giles a friend and counsellor.

After tea, on the afternoon referred to in the last chapter,

Anna took a bundle of clothing she had provided for them, and went over to the widow's cottage, thinking of the new world of thought and feeling which had opened to her, since she walked that path with a load upon her soul, like a mountain, pressing her down to the earth. It was but a few months since, but she had lived more within that time, than in years of her previous existence. As she approached the cottage gate, she heard her friend singing in tones of peculiar pathos :

“Parting soul, the floods await thee,
And the billows round thee roar!
Yet rejoice—the Holy City
Stands on yon celestial shore.

Linger not, the stream is narrow,
Though its cold dark waters rise:
He who passed its floods before thee,
Guides thy path to yonder skies.”

The mother sat rocking the suffering child in her arms, whose little race of life was almost run, and soothing him with words, directing his thoughts to that happy country, where there was no more pain, and sorrow, and parting. As Anna entered, she motioned to her to go on, as she laid her bundle on the table, and seated herself by her side.

“Will it be long before I go over that river, mother?” asked the child earnestly, looking up into that face, which could not conceal a pang, at the thought of giving up the *last* one object of her affections.

“God only knows, my child,” she answered, with a quivering lip, and forcing down the murmur in her heart, told him of his joy and blessedness, when he should go to be with the angels, and to become like them; and meet his father and little sisters there; and by and by, she would come too; God willing, she hoped it would not be long—then they would be an unbroken family in heaven.

Comforting thought! Worth more to us, when we feel the hand of death clutching at our heart-strings—as all must sooner or later—than mountains of gold and gems, though they should outweigh all the available riches of earth! Poor widow! In your lonely home, your only earthly treasure pluming its wings to flee away from your embracing arms—and all the remaining journey of life looking dark and drear—your *two mites*, even of good deeds and cheering words, will some day outweigh the wealth of many a Dives rolling in splendor, who by and by will wake up in torment!

“Will the angels meet me on the way?” asked the child, rolling his earnest eyes toward the cloud-draped west. “Will they meet me up yonder in those golden clouds, mother, that I may not have to go alone?” Ah! poor mortals! we are but children—all. Whether we have lived many years, or few years—we tremble alike before the untried path—the uncertain leap—fearing to lean upon the staff of Faith, and to trust our all to the keeping of Him who has promised to sustain us, and to bear us safely over to the portals of peace. “Fear not,” saith the Great Comforter, “behold I am with you, my rod, and my staff, they shall comfort you.”

The scene at the cottage brought visibly before Anna’s mind, another long since passed, and where the characters were reversed. The mother was dying triumphing and exultant in a Savior’s peace-speaking and joy-imparting love; and the child, tearful and trembling before the gloomy sojourn, which awaited her, in this vale of tears.

And as Anna was on her way home, she took from her bosom a locket, and sitting down by the brook-side, gazed long and earnestly on this only relic left her of her long-dead mother. She gazed till the tears blinded her eyes, and the scene before her was a dimly-lighted room, in which was a bed, and on that bed a form stiffening in the embrace of death.

“Is that a cherished relic of a friend, Anna?” said a voice at her side.

Slightly starting, and brushing away her tears, she replied: "you have a mother, Mr. Halley, and can better answer that question than I."

"A mother is certainly the most precious and the truest of all earthly friends. But, Anna, you do not mean that you have no mother?"

"I?—I never knew a mother's love—before I learned to prize her, she was gone."

"Is it possible!" replied Halley; "are you not"——

"Anna Clayton?" she said, interrupting him; "no, that is but a foster name. Look here," she continued, touching a spring which opened on the back of the locket, "this is all I know of my history."

Halley took it, and in a curl of glossy black hair, read these words traced with a feeble hand.

"My child, after the hand which writes these lines is cold and stiffened in death, let this be to you a token of a mother's love, and of her earnest prayers, that in taking her name, you may not inherit her errors or her misfortunes.

ELLEN FORBES."

This seemed not a little to surprise Mr. Halley, and he re-read it; then gazing on the features, beautiful, yet strongly marked with sorrow, exclaimed, "Ellen Forbes! What mysteries truly throng our pathway at every turn! Ellen Forbes! Excuse me, Anna, I was altogether unprepared for this! But I cannot tell you now, at another time perhaps I will explain myself. Shall we not go up to the house? the dew is falling, and I came out to seek you, as our clerical friends are anxious to resume the investigation; and as you are the one to be particularly benefited, it is necessary you should be present." Thus saying, he drew her hand within his arm, and they walked almost silently homeward.

Can it be possible, thought Anna, that he knows anything about my mother's history! O, what wealth it would be to know that I have a relative on earth—perhaps a mother's sister, or a cousin! The question was almost asked, but the moon-beams revealed to her that her companion was unnaturally pale and self-absorbed; and with an effort she restrained her impatience.

“What shall I say to you, young truants?” said Elder Clayton, meeting them at the door with his kindly smile. “Here we have been waiting with Romans this hour,—Mr. Halley, take this seat. Brother Burton, I think that remark you made just now was quite striking. I wish you would repeat it to our young friends.”

Brother Burton glanced furtively at the self-poised air of his young antagonist, and having hemmed once or twice, remarked that it certainly was a very important truth. “I would not be afraid to risk the argument on this point alone,” said he. “When we wish to know the meaning of an English word, we go to the Dictionary, and with its explanation we are bound to be satisfied. So when we want to know the meaning of a Greek word, we must go to a Greek Dictionary or Lexicon, and that settles the matter at once. If the Lexicon says that βαπτίζω (*baptizo*), means *to dip, to plunge, to immerse*, then immersion is baptism, and *only* immersion is baptism; but if it says, *to pour, to sprinkle*, then I yield the argument.”

“George, have you a Greek Lexicon?” asked Elder Clayton.

“Yes, I have two—Donnegan's, and Robinson's of the New Testament.

“Robinson,” said Elder Clayton, “I think your professor in languages, when I visited you at college, told me, Dr. Robinson was the best Greek scholar in the country. Is he not good authority, Brother Burton?”

“I think it must be admitted,” replied Brother Burton, “that he has very few superiors in the classics, and in Biblical literature.”

“Let us see then, George, what he says about this matter,” continued Elder Clayton.

“βαπτίζω (*baptizo*), to dip in, to sink, to immerse, to wash, to lave, to cleanse by washing, to baptize, to administer the rite of baptism, either that of John or of Christ.”

“Now what can our Pedo friends say to that?” exclaimed Brother Burton with an air of triumph.

“You say truly,” remarked Halley, “that Mr. Robinson is the best Greek scholar in our country; he truly is inferior to none, and his researches have been very extended in this department, and also in that of Biblical literature. Hand me the book, if you please, George, and let me see what he says in a note under the word βαπτίζω (*baptizo*): here it is, page 119: it reads: “In the earliest Latin versions of the New Testament, as for example, the *Itala*, which Augustine regarded as the best of all, and which goes back apparently to the second century, and to usage connected with the apostolic age, the Greek verb βαπτίζω is uniformly given in the Latin form *baptizo*, and is never translated by *immergo* or any like word; showing that there was something in the rite of baptism to which the latter did not correspond.”

“If I were a lawyer, as I expect to be some day,” said George; “I should ask Mr. Robinson what he means by saying that a thing is so and so, and then immediately thereafter saying it an’t so.”

“Yes,” said Brother Burton, “here he says it means to dip; and there in the note, that it *don’t* mean to dip! Did you ever see such inconsistency?”

“A man of his standing and reputation,” said Halley, “would not risk it rashly by such a contradiction. Let us turn to his Preface, and see what he says about the difference between the Classic Greek and the Hellenistic or New Testament Greek. You will bear in mind, that in this Lexicon he gives first the Classical signification of words, and then secondly the force

they have in the Hellenistic Greek—just as George read of βαπτίζω—first, *to dip, to sink, to immerse, &c.*; and then, secondly, *to baptize, to administer the rite of baptism*, either that of John or of Christ. If you were reading Xenophon or Plato, here is your standard of the meaning of words, as truly given as by any lexicographer living; but if you are reading the New Testament it will not do in all cases to apply the same meaning; it would in many instances make the veriest nonsense, and therefore he has given us a second meaning, which the context and parallel passages demand for such words. But let us hear what Mr. Robinson himself says about this matter. Preface, page 5: ‘In respect to the Greek, it should be borne in mind that there are three great epochs which mark the progress of the language; through all, or some of which, the *different meanings and uses* of a word can be traced with more or less distinctness. These are *its youth*, in the heroic or epic poems of Homer and Hesiod, with which may be joined the Ionic prose of Herodotus; *its prime*, in the palmy days of Attic elegance and purity, as exhibited in the great tragedians, and in the prose of Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato; and *its decline*, after the Macedonian conquest, and still later under the Roman dominion. In this latter period, the breaking up of the various independent states, the mingling together in armies of soldiers enlisted from every quarter, and the founding of colonies and large cities peopled with inhabitants from every part of Greece, and also from foreign lands, could not fail to produce great changes in the language of different communities, which, by natural consequence, would speedily be reflected in the language of books. * * * The language of the New Testament is *the later Greek language, as spoken by foreigners of the Hebrew stock, and applied by them to subjects on which it had never been employed by native Greek writers*. The simple statement of this fact suggests at once what the character of this idiom must be; and might, one would think, have saved volumes of con-

troversy. The Jews came in contact with the Greeks only at and after the Macedonian conquests; and were therefore conversant only with the later Greek. They learned it from the intercourse of life, in commerce, in colonies, in cities founded like Alexandria, where the inhabitants were drawn together from Asia as well as from Greece; and it was therefore the *spoken language of common life, and not that of books*, with which they became acquainted. But they spoke it as foreigners, as Hebrews, and therefore it could not fail to have in general a coloring of the Hebrew, or rather of the later Aramaean, which was their vernacular tongue. Jews who spoke Greek, are called in the New Testament Ἑλληνισταί (*Hellenisti*) Hellenists; and hence in modern usage, since the time of the younger Scaliger, the Jewish Greek (which is that of the New Testament) has not unaptly been termed *Hellenistic*. * * *

“The writers of the New Testament with the exception of Paul, and partially, perhaps, of Luke, were unlearned men; and, like the rest of their countrymen, knew the Greek language only from the intercourse of common life, and not from books. With them, therefore, the Hebrew element which mingled in their idiom, would naturally have great prominence; although, since their writings are not translated from a Hebrew original, it is not here as strongly marked as in the Septuagint. * * *

“The writers of the New Testament applied the Greek language to subjects on which it had never been employed by native Greek writers. No native Greek had ever written on Jewish affairs, nor on Jewish theology and ritual. Hence the Seventy, in their translation (the Septuagint), had often to *employ Greek words as the signs of things and ideas, which heretofore had been expressed only in the Hebrew*. In such a case they could only select those Greek words which most nearly corresponded to the Hebrew, *leaving the different shade or degree of signification to be gathered by the reader from the context*. * * * But *beyond* this, the writers of the New Testament were

to be the instruments of making known a new revelation — a new dispensation of mercy to mankind. Here was opened a wide circle of new ideas and new doctrines to be developed, *for which all human language was as yet too poor*, and this poverty was to be done away, even as at the present day on the discovery and culture of a new science, *chiefly by enlarging the signification and application of words already in use*, rather than by the formation of new ones. * * The New Testament, then, was written by Hebrews, aiming to express Hebrew thoughts, conceptions and feelings, in the Greek tongue. Their idiom, consequently, in soul and spirit, is Hebrew; in its external form, Greek, and that more or less pure, according to the facilities which an individual writer may have possessed for acquiring fluency and accuracy of expression in that tongue.’”

“But I don’t see as this bears very much upon the point,” said Brother Burton; “he an’t talking about the word βαπτίζω (*baptizo*).”

“Is he not?” replied Halley, “when he tells you that much of the New Testament, or Hellenistic Greek has not a classical significance; and then when you come to the word βαπτίζω, tells you in his second meaning that in the New Testament it only means *to baptize, to administer the rite of baptism*, and in the note gives you further evidence that it has not a *classical* meaning?”

“It seems,” said George, “that this opinion of his is based not only on the context where the word is found in the New Testament, but also on the fact that in all the early Latin translations, of which the *Itala* is one, the word is transcribed and not translated.”

“Yes,” replied Halley, “that is so, and does it not have great force — is it not significant? When you recollect the Latin language was then the vernacular tongue of a heathen nation, and was as poor in words expressing spiritual ideas, as that of any other heathen nation, you will at once discover the

force of this reason. The Greek was also the language of a heathen nation, although it had been appropriated by the Jews in their Septuagint translation and therein somewhat Hebraized. The purely Greek sense of the word βαπτίζω is, as we have learned, *to dip, to immerse*; and in the Latin there are *intingo* and *immergo*, which also mean *to dip*, and *to immerse*. Then if the translators understood βαπτίζω in its purely Greek, or classical sense, how easy it would have been to have conveyed the idea of dipping or immersing to the mind of a Roman, by simply rendering it *intingo* or *immergo*; and would they not, in all common sense, most assuredly have done so, or have rendered it in some way, *if they conceived it to have a specific meaning*, corresponding to their conceptions of its true import, and thus have conveyed some *definite* and *specific* idea to the mind of the reader? Their transcribing it, without translation, is a strong and irrefragable argument that there was nothing in the Latin tongue corresponding to the Christian meaning and import of the word."

"There must be translations into other languages," said George, "dating back to about that time; what is their testimony?"

"You will find their testimony quite uniform," said Halley, smiling, "though more forcible. For example, there is the *Peshito*, a Syriac version, and the *oldest* translation of the New Testament extant, which, probably, was made soon after the death of the Evangelist John. The testimony of James Murdock, D. D., of New Haven, as stated in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, I have in my room; I will get it and see what he says. Here it is (vol. vii. p. 733): 'The *Peshito* was probably made in the very next age after the Apostles, and by apostolic men; and in a language almost identical with the vernacular tongue of Jesus Christ and his disciples. And it may be supposed that the Apostles themselves, and all the first preachers of the Gospel among the Syrians, adopted this phraseology, and of course that the trans-

lators of the Peshito had apostolic authority for their mode of designating baptism. The Peshito *uniformly* renders the Greek word βαπτίζω by a Syriac verb meaning 'to stand,' in all the seventy-three (73) places where βαπτίζω occurs. And this verb in the Peshito is never used with reference to anything besides baptism, with this one exception that the Greek word στῦλος (*stulos*), a column, a pillar, in all the four places in which it occurs in the New Testament, is rendered by a derivative of this verb. This derivative signifies a pillar or column that stands erect and firm.' 'He further proves,' continued Halley, 'that this Syriac word which is only used to designate the ordinance of baptism, has only the signification, to stand, to be established, and the like.'

"I'll warrant you these are all Pedos, every one of them," exclaimed Brother Burton.

"But where is your Baptist authority, where your Baptist scholar who has consulted Syriac, and found this to be false?" responded Halley. "Is it to be supposed that men like Dr. James Murdock, and scores of others, would risk their reputation as scholars, by stating things which other scholars would know to be untrue? Or their characters as Christians by giving birth to a falsehood, inculcating error, and advocating a lie? They would be immediately exposed and disgraced. But what says Prof. Moses Stuart about this translation? You will find it in the *Biblical Repository*, vol. iii. p. 362. 'This version is the oldest of all the translations of the New Testament that are extant; for in all probability it should be dated during the first half of the second century (from 100-140, A. D.). Withal, it is admitted by those who are able to consult it, to be one of the most faithful and authentic of all the ancient versions. How does this translate the word in question (βαπτίζω)? *Only and always*, by a word which corresponds to the Hebrew מַתַּח (ü*h*-*math*); the Chaldee מַתַּח (ü*h*-*math*); and the same word in Arabic. This is a very remarkable cir-

cumstance, for the Syriac has a word like the Chaldee צָבַע (tsē-vhä); and the corresponding Hebrew טָבַל (tä-shal); which means *to plunge, to dip, to immerse, &c.* Why should it employ this word to render βαπτίζω? * * The Hebrew, Chaldee and Arabic, all agree in assigning to the same (Syriac) word, the sense of the Latin, *stare, prostare, fulcire, and robore*, (“to stand,” “to stand fast,” “to sustain,” “to make strong.”)

“We come almost necessarily to the conclusion, then, inasmuch as the Syriac has an appropriate word, which signifies *to dip, plunge, immerse*, and yet it is *never* employed in the Peshito, that the translator did not deem it important to designate any particular mode of baptism, but only to designate the rite by a term which evidently means *confirm, establish, etc.* Baptism, then, in the language of the Peshito, is *the rite of confirmation*, simply, while the *manner* of this is apparently left without being at all expressed.’ So says Prof. M. Stuart,” continued Halley, “than whom there were few who were better able to judge; and whose philological exposition of the word βαπτίζω, your Baptist writers have regarded very highly, and used as *authority* in as far as they could *make* it tend to strengthen their position.

“Now let us read Mark xvi. 16, according to the Baptist rendering of the word, and then the Syriac. ‘He that believeth and is *immersed* shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned;’ says the Baptist, making two distinct conditions, as necessary to salvation, the first a spiritual and the other an external rite. Ask them if they believe this, they say, no; but still they persist in giving it this rendering, which indeed they *must* do, or immediately give up the controversy about the word. I have often heard the text quoted from the pulpit, to enforce the importance of immersion in this language; ‘*He that believeth and is immersed shall be saved;*’ but question

those very same ministers of the Gospel, if they believe immersion necessary to salvation, and they will reply, 'No — no, we don't believe it *necessary* to salvation, but then here is the text, and what will you do with it?' They pretend not to believe it, and yet they preach it indirectly from the pulpit, and directly in their actions and exclusiveness; and actions speak louder and more forcibly than words, you know.

"The Syriac translation would read thus: 'He that believeth and *standeth fast* in his faith, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.' Which of these views commends itself to the enlightened understanding and conscience? Which harmonizes with the teachings of the word of God? For the first you may search the whole Bible through, and you cannot find a parallel text to support it. But the second, in spirit and in precept, harmonizes with every part of the word of God. Jesus says in Matthew, 'He that endureth to the *end*, shall be saved;' and again, when he appeared to John in the Isle of Patmos, 'He that overcometh and keepeth my works *unto the end*, to him will I give power,' etc. There must be a continuance in believing, a holding fast unto the end, and this we are enabled to do through the assisting agency of the Spirit of God."

"Is not this Syriac view like that we have found by an examination of the English translation?" asked Anna, no longer able to restrain her interest in the controversy, and seating herself by the table. "I can see but one difficulty, and that is the phraseology attending this word βαπτίζω, '*down into and up from the water — baptized IN the river Jordan,*' etc. This indicates the form of immersion, and would to my mind give that form the preference, even if there is no stronger testimony. If the Christian use of the word was to designate the *rite*, without reference to the form, still some form must have been used, and whatever the context indicates, that I should prefer."

"Yes," said Brother Burton; "if we should give up this

word βαπτίζω to you, these little troublesome particles would set all right. There's no getting round them. There they are in Greek, ἐν (*en*), and εἰς (*eis*), *in* and *into*, and of as much importance, and having the same meaning, as *in* and *into* in English."

"But I don't see the necessity of giving up this word so easily," said Father Longwind. "Let's bring up the Bible, and see what that says about it."

"Yes; what do *we* care for this Syriac, and Chaldee, and Arabic, and Hindoo, and I don't know what all!" exclaimed mother Clayton, giving her knitting-needles an extra flourish, "plain English is all we want! What has *Italy* and *Peshito* to do with the matter, I would like to know? I'm almost out of patience with the whole of you!"

"The *Itala* and *Peshito*, mother," said Anna, "have, and should have, far more weight than our English translation, as they were made centuries—yes, more than a thousand years—nearly fifteen hundred—before, in the very next generation after the Apostles; and by men who doubtless had been taught by the Apostles: whereas, our translation is not only obliged to go back to the old manuscripts of those times for its authority, but is separated from the habits, manners and customs of that age, not by centuries of years only, but by many centuries of midnight moral, intellectual, and religious darkness. And besides all this in the *Peshito*, there is the advantage of having a translation of this very disputed word, which our copy has not, and which shows us that they in the apostolic age gave it a *generic* signification, and not a *specific* one."

"But God gave us our Bible," said Elder Clayton, "and no doubt we shall be judged by it just as it is."

"He did not give it to *us* directly by inspiration," said Halley. "The translators were not inspired to translate correctly. Strictly speaking, there is but one altogether pure fountain direct from the hands of God, and that is the original manu-

script in the language used by the inspired penman, and by those to whom the manuscript was at that time transmitted. I think I am safe in saying that no translator can in *all* cases give the exact shade of meaning in the mind of the author, when translating his work into another language."

"But the translators are the next best authority," said Brother Burton. "Those who can read nothing but English, must depend on them."

"Have we not been citing their authority?" said Halley; "men who have spent many years in acquiring a perfect knowledge of these languages, and by unremitting toil have capacitated themselves for this work, and who, with the fear of God before them, have done nobly and labored faithfully — and yet authority like this you set aside, because, forsooth, it does not suit your notion of matters! We have even given you the authority of men, who, if not inspired themselves, were at least taught by inspired men; and their testimony has no more weight against your preconceived opinions, than so much Hindoo gibberish! What further can be done? What shall we now do but meet you upon your own ground? Let us take the English translation then, just as it is. Let us keep in mind that *baptize* always means, *dip, plunge, immerse*, etc. You say there is no provision for anything else in the Classic Greek. Let us call up the first witness then in the New Testament. Mr. Matthew, you have made a great mistake in saying, I baptize you *with* water! Either you, or the translators, have made bungling work of it. Don't you know, Matthew, that the subject is to be applied *to the water*, and not the water *to* the subject? You should have said baptize, or dip you *in* water, then it would have been all right.

"Again you persist in saying, 'He shall baptize you *with* the Holy Ghost and *with* fire — how is it that you are determined to give expression to such absurdities! One would suppose that you could see the inconsistency of it yourself, and there-

fore not repeat it again and again as you do greatly to our annoyance! And not only you, Matthew, but your fellow-laborers, Mark, and Luke, and John, have done the same thing. And what ninnies they all must have been, not to keep a figure better! Just hear Peter, when he speaks of the baptism of the Holy Ghost—mark how he invariably says that it was *poured out or fell on them!* How forcible this must have been to the mind of Peter, and to all who heard him—when they knew to be baptized was to be *dipped into something!* And then what a beautiful figure is this—‘Know ye not that as many as were *dipped into Jesus Christ were dipped into his death!*’ and this also—‘*They were all dipped into Moses, in the cloud and in the sea.*’ And again: ‘*As many as have been dipped into Christ have put on Christ;*’ and yet once again: ‘*For by one Spirit are we all dipped into one body.*’ There is also your favorite text, ‘One Lord, one faith, and *ONE dipping,*’ But how will you harmonize this last passage with Paul’s admonition to the Hebrews, that they should leave the principles of the doctrine of Christ, and go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, of the doctrine of *dippings*, and of laying on of hands, etc. Here you see Paul refers to more than *one* baptism, or *dipping*, as you will have it! But what nonsense is all this—he who robs the word of God of its consistency and spirit, must be *guilty* in the sight of God; and in His hands I am willing to leave him.”

“I was thinking,” said Anna, “how much of the Bible would have been strange reading if the word βαπτίζω had been translated *dip* or *immerse*. The *dipping* of John, whence was it, from heaven or of men? I have a *dipping* to be *dipped* with and how am I straitened until it be accomplished. Are ye able to be *dipped* with the *dipping* that I am *dipped* with?”

George laughed outright, and apologized by saying it reminded him of “Peter Piper’s peck of pickled peppers.”

“I think no one can fail to see,” said Halley, “the absurdity of limiting this word to the strictly specific meaning it is said to have in classic Greek. That it was understood by the early Christian fathers as a *generic* term implying only the rite of baptism, is evident from the fact that when Origen and Augustine desired to speak *definitely* of immersion, βαπτισμός (*baptismos*) is not generally used, but instead κατάδύσις (*katadusis*), and ἀνάδύσις (*anadusis*). Why is this if βαπτισμός (*baptismos*) is specific, and means nothing but dipping or immersing — can any one tell us?

“But this word is not the only one for which we claim this license. In the time of the Christian fathers this principle was felt as an imperative necessity, and it was acted upon. It seems that in those days there were some who were over-nice about the ‘mint and the cummin;’ who had a superstitious reverence for the previous signification of words, as there are now in these times; and in searching through the Latin language, they could find no word that corresponded to their idea of the full meaning of σωτήρ (*sōtēr*) a *Savior*. This caused considerable perplexity for some time, but at last the good sense of the strong-minded Augustine disposed of the difficulty by making no scruple of employing the Latin word *Salvator*, observing well, and with true insight into the law of the growth of words, that ‘It was not good Latin before the Savior came, but when he came he made it to be such—for as shadows follow substances, so words result from things.’ Also,” continued Halley, “the Greek word πίστις (*pistis*) signified merely *belief*, in classic Greek; yet we apply to it in the New Testament, ‘*faith in God*.’ So also λόγος (*logos*) meant only *speech, word, discourse*, in the classic Greek, yet we apply to it, and of necessity it must read for, ‘*Christ, the eternal son of God*.’

“Δικαιοσύνη (*dikiosune*), signified in classic Greek *doing right, being just and proper*; but in the Hellenistic Greek, *righteousness, Godliness*; also *the righteousness of God* imparted to

believers on account of their faith in Christ. See Rom. ix. 30, and x. 5, 6; and 2 Cor. iii. 9, and v. 21, etc.

“Χριστός (*Christos*), in Classic — *rubbed over with anything, anointed*; but in the New Testament, *Christ, the Messiah*.

“Ἐπιούσιος (*epiousios*), rendered in Matt. vi. 11, *daily*, is not found in classic Greek at all. Neither are the following words. ἀγάπη (*agape*), *love, love to God, God's love to Christ and to men, and Christ's love to men*; see John xvii. 26, and Col. i. 13.

“Ἀγενεαλόγητος (*agenealogetos*), Heb. vii. 3, *without genealogy*.

“Ἀγιάζω (*Hagiazō*), *to make clean, to be holy*.

“Ἀγιασμός (*Hagiasmos*), *sanctification, purity of heart, holiness, etc.*

“There are a host of others; these I find by turning over a very few leaves of the Lexicon.”

“Are there not numerous examples of such growth of words, and also of the coining of new ones, in our language?” asked Anna.

“Certainly, almost beyond computation,” responded Halley. “Our language is constantly changing; many words have grown out of their original meaning entirely; others become obsolete, whilst new ones are continually being coined to meet the demand made on our language by the progress of science, and the changes in the manners and customs of the people. We have recently coined *dough-faced, fillibuster, telegram*, etc. There are thousands of scientific terms which have been introduced within a few years. Whereas, some words become obsolete, and then are again put in circulation, as for instance, *ignore*. But those which have changed their primitive signification, are still more numerous.

“*Pagan* formerly only meant a dweller in a hamlet or village, in distinction from those dwelling in towns and cities.

“*Heathen*, no more than a heath-dweller.

“*Knave*, a lad. *Villian*, a peasant. *Virtue*, only warlike courage. *Martyr*, simply a witness. *Sacrament*, at first a

deposit or pledge, then a military oath, thereafter any solemn oath whatever. Thus we could go on almost *ad infinitum*; but let us rather consult Prof. R. C. Trench, B. D., one of the most learned men in England. In his work on the 'Study of Words,' which is purely a scientific work, and cannot, therefore, be suspected of sectarian bias, he says, p. 118: 'The cause which more than any other creates the necessity for these additions to the vocabulary of a language, and calls forth the words which shall supply this necessity when it is felt, is, beyond a question, this — namely; that in the appointment of highest wisdom there are certain cardinal epochs in the world's history, in which, far more than at other times, new moral and spiritual forces begin to work, and to stir society to its central depths. When it is thus with a people, they make claims upon their language, which were never made upon it hitherto. It is required to utter truths, to express ideas, which were strange to it in the time of its first moulding and shaping, and for which therefore the terms sufficient will naturally not be found in it at once; these new thoughts and feelings being larger and deeper than any with which hitherto the speakers of that tongue had been familiar. But when the bed of a river is suddenly required to deliver a far greater volume of waters than till now has been its wont, it is nothing strange if it should surmount its banks, break forth on the right hand and on the left, or even force new channels with something of violence for itself. The most illustrious example of this whereof I have been speaking, would be, of course, the coming in of Christianity, or, to include the anterior dispensation, we may say, of revealed religion into the ancient heathen world, with the consequent necessity under which the great novel truths which were then proclaimed to mankind, lay, of clothing themselves in the language of men, in the languages of Greece and Rome — *languages which in their previous form might have sufficed, and did suffice, for heathenism, sensuous and finite as it was, but not for*

the spiritual and infinite of the new dispensation. How often had these new thoughts to weave a new garment for themselves, inasmuch as that which they found ready-made, was too narrow to wrap themselves withal; the new wine to find new vessels for itself, that both might be preserved, the old vessels being neither sufficiently strong nor expansive to hold it.

“Thus, not to speak of mere technical matters, which would claim their utterance, how could the Greek language have had a word for ‘idolatry,’ so long as the sense of the awful contrast between the worship of the living God and of dead things, had not risen up in their minds that spoke it? But when those began to use Greek, and that as the sole utterance of what was in them, men to whom this distinction and contrast was the most earnest and the deepest conviction of their lives, the words ‘idolatry, idolator,’ of necessity appeared. The heathen claimed not for their deities to be ‘searchers of hearts,’ disclaimed not for them the being ‘accepters of persons;’ such attributes of power and righteousness entered not into their minds as pertaining to the objects of their worship. The Greek language, therefore, so long as *they only* employed it, had not the words corresponding. * * *

“These are, as I said, the most illustrious examples of the coming in of a new world of thoughts and feelings into the bosom of humanity, *whereby has been necessitated a corresponding creation in the world of words.* * * * Where the movement is a great popular one, stirring the heart and mind of a people to its very depths, such as the first reception of the Christian world, there these new words will be for the most part born out of their bosoms, a free spontaneous birth, seldom or never capable of being referred to one man more than another, because they belong to all.”

“I think,” said Anna, “that there need not be another word said on this point. Evidences the most conclusive and satisfactory have been given to show that the Apostles not only ex-

tended and enlarged the signification of words, but even in many cases were obliged to create new ones to meet the demands of the new thoughts they labored to express. To know whether they extended the meaning of the word in question, we have only to open our Bibles and read. I for one will not persist in making Peter and the other Apostles, and even our Savior himself, utter absurdities like this; 'Then the Holy Ghost *fell* on all them that heard the word, as on us at the beginning. And then remembered I the word of the Lord, how he said, John indeed dipped with water, but ye shall be *dipped* with the Holy Ghost.' Think for a moment of the form, '*I dip you with the Holy Ghost!*'

"The baptism of the Holy Ghost in regard to its agent, subject, means and effect, demands the idea of purification, and excludes that of the form — that of dipping; for the agent is the Divine Spirit, the subject the human spirit, the means spiritual, and the effect purity; in such relations the term *dip* is absurd! For any one to persist that *dip* must be the meaning, because it had been used in that sense by heathen writers for centuries before that day, looks to me just about as consistent, as it would for a Frenchman to insist on giving *heathen* the meaning of '*heath-dweller*,' simply from the fact that it was the *original* import of the word."

"Stop here a moment," said Halley; "you are about stumbling over an important idea. You have traced the baptism of the Spirit through to its effect — purity. Now look at the original signification of the word βαπτίζω, and then remember that water is the agent most generally used as the means of the purification of material things; the cleansing being accomplished by applying the water in some way to the object, or the object to the water, and can you not discover the reason of their employing this word, which was probably the one that expressed most nearly their meaning? But if you suppose that their choice arose from the *manner* or *mode* implied in the

word, you will be at once corrected. The heathen Greek used it to convey the idea of the *object* being applied *to* the agent, which is water, that is, the thing was dipped *in* water, or whatever fluid was used; but the Christian Greek must have understood that the *agent* was to be applied *to* the object, that is, the Spirit applied to the hearts and consciences of men. For example: when Homer speaks of a smith baptizing an ax in water, we know he meant that the ax was plunged into the water for the purpose of hardening it, although the end to be obtained is not indicated by the word. The word simply expresses the idea of putting the object into the water. And when Plutarch says that the Roman general baptized his hand in blood; or Hemolaus, that he dipped his pitcher in the water, we gather that these objects were dipped into the fluids, but for what purpose it does not appear from the word employed to indicate the action. Hence, as they used it, the word had a specific meaning, which merely expressed the idea of dipping the object into the agent without indicating the purpose for which it was thus dipped.

“In the New Testament this word is *never* used in this sense in regard to the ordinance of baptism. Although water as the agent is generally preceded by the prepositions *ἐν* or *ἐν*, yet even in classic Greek, as you may learn from Donnegan’s Lexicon, *ἐν* means *with* and *by*, as well as *in*. So it might read, I baptize you *with* water or *by* water, just as properly as *in* water; therefore you have only *negative* testimony whereon to build your faith. But now turn to Luke iii. 16, and Acts i. 5, and xi. 16, and we have *no* prepositions whatever before the noun water (*ὑδατι* — *hudati*). George, look up those passages in your Greek Testament, and see if I have stated it correctly. Do you find any prepositions before the noun water (*ὑδωρ* — *hudōr*)?”

“No, there is no preposition used: the noun stands in the dative case, *ὑδατι* (*hudati*),” answered George.

“When nouns are used in this way, what is indicated?” asked Halley.

“They are thus used in the dative without a preposition,” replied George, “only as a *means* or *instrument*, and *never* as a place *in which* anything is said *to be* or *to be done*.”

“Just so,” said Halley; “and here then is *positive* evidence to the point in question. According to Luke’s testimony, John did *not* baptize *in* water, but *with* water, merely *used* water as an instrument. In Acts i. 5, as recorded, our Savior said, that John did *not* baptize *in* water, but only employed water as a means in administering the ordinance. In Acts xi. 16, Peter in repeating the words of our Lord, repeated them faithfully, and said John did *not* baptize *in* water, but simply used water in the ordinance of baptism. Therefore, if you insist that *ἐν* shall be rendered *in*, in spite of every Greek lexicographer assuring you that it may mean *with* just as properly, you thereby put Matthew, Mark, and John, against Jesus Christ, Luke, and Peter. One or the other party tells not what is true! *You make* the first party say that John baptized *in* water, when the second party distinctly and definitely assert that he did not baptize *in* water, but only used water in the ordinance as an instrument—he baptized *with* water. To which party do you choose to give the lie? It was in view of this that our translators uniformly gave the form ‘*with* the Holy Ghost,’ etc., that the passages might more readily be harmonized; for it *must* be rendered *with*, in the passages above cited, and might *properly* be, wherever the word with the preposition occurs. They chose to believe that John did not baptize *in* water, rather than to twist the word of God into a direct contradiction of terms. And now upon this we have but to heap the evidences regarding the *form* of Spirit baptism, which are uniform and direct whenever spoken of in the word of God. For example, see John i. 32, ‘And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it *abode upon him*.’ Acts ii. 3,

‘And there appeared cloven tongues like as of fire, and it *sat upon each of them.*’ Acts ii. 33, ‘And having received the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath *shed forth* this which ye now see and hear.’ Acts viii. 16–17, ‘For as yet he (the Holy Ghost) *had fallen* upon none of them; then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost.’ Also Acts x. 44, ‘While Peter yet spake these words, the *Holy Ghost fell* on all them which heard the word.’ Acts xi. 15–16, ‘And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost *fell on them*, as on us at the beginning; then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.’ Acts xix. 6, ‘And when Paul had laid his hands on them, the Holy Ghost *came on them.*’

“In not *one* instance is the object applied to the agent, that is, the person to the Spirit, as you would have it, and as the heathen Greek writers employed the word; but instead, the agent invariably to the object. This is the only difference between *us* on this point, and our Baptist friends. We apply the water to the person, thus making it a means or instrument in administering the ordinance of baptism, as our Savior, and Luke and Peter declare John did; and by so doing, we find it truly an appropriate and beautiful figure of the Holy Spirit being applied to the human spirit, *falling upon, coming down upon, poured out upon, and shed forth upon*, etc.

“What we are after is the Christian use of this word: how the heathen Greeks used it, is a matter of no consequence, as long as Christians used it otherwise. We can say, as Augustine did in regard to the Latin word *Salvator*, that this use of βαπτίζω was not good Greek until it was Christianized. We will also find that the idea conveyed in the Christian use of baptism was not the *form* of administering the rite, but the *end* to be gained by it—the effect to be produced by the substance of which it is the shadow—that through it we are puri-

fied, cleansed, regenerated, sanctified and sealed, unto the day of redemption: this was urged to impress its importance."

"Ah! you would then do away with water baptism altogether?" exclaimed Brother Burton.

"No, we would do no such thing," continued Halley; "but we would keep it in its proper place and put it to its proper use. The Bible everywhere represents it as subordinate—a mere symbol of the other—by it we acknowledge our need of the other. Its use, and only use, is to bring before our minds the operation of the Holy Spirit, through which we are cleansed, and thus acknowledge to the world our necessity of Him; as the only use of the Lord's Supper is to bring before us the broken body and spilt blood of our dying Lord, through which atonement is made, and thus evince our faith in its efficacy. John the Baptist, who is generally considered as having instituted the outward ordinance, said, 'I knew him not, but that he should be made manifest, *therefore* am I come, baptizing with water, and he upon whom the Spirit descendeth, he shall baptize with the Holy Ghost.' From this view of the case, you see at once that to make it a perfect symbol, it should be applied in that way that will most perfectly symbolize the Spirit baptism. Even if we had no direct testimony to the point, our reason would teach us that as its only value is in being a symbol, therefore the more perfect the symbol, the more valuable. Now let us review the ground gone over. Christ and the Apostles spiritualized this word by making the agent, object, means and effect implied, all spiritual; and to help sensuous man to comprehend this and to keep it in view, God instituted a material ordinance as a type of this spiritual operation. In this type, water is used. How used? Let us examine for a moment. If the person is *dipped into* the water, it ceases to be a symbol—at least a perfect one; the water should be applied *to* the person, for the Divine Spirit is applied *to* the human spirit, and never is the person represented as being dipped into the Holy Spirit."

“I would like to ask one question here,” said Anna; “What were the Jewish modes of purifying? They must have been familiar with the idea, as their rites were divided into two general classes — those prefiguring the Great Atoning and the Great Sanctifying Powers.”

“The *sprinkling* of blood and of water,” said Halley, “was to the Jews the grand emblem of purification. Although the blood was sometimes poured out at the base of the altar, and sometimes smeared on its horns, or on parts of the person for whom expiation was to be made, yet the grand significant emblem was *sprinkling*. When the whole nation was consecrated to God at Mount Sinai, they, and the books of the law, and the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry, were *sprinkled* with blood. Paul says it was necessary that they should be *purified* with these sprinklings (see Heb. ix. 19–21). Paul also, as it were, gives a summary of the whole ritual of purification, by specifying the most significant of its usages—namely, that of the ashes of a heifer mixed with water (Numbers xix. 17) with which the unclean were *sprinkled* (Heb. ix. 13).

“On the great day of atonement the high-priest entered the most holy place and *sprinkled* the Ark of the Covenant with blood (Lev. iv. 17 and Heb. ix. 25).

“And the prophet Ezekiel speaks of water to be *sprinkled* under the new dispensation. After describing the gathering in of all the Jews into the kingdom of Christ, he represents Jehovah as saying, ‘Then will I *sprinkle* clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you, a new heart will I give you,’ etc. (Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26).

“Paul also uses the same figure, when he speaks of drawing near to God with a full assurance of faith, having our hearts *sprinkled* from an evil conscience, etc. (Heb. x. 22.) And Peter, when he says: ‘Elect unto obedience through sanctification of the Spirit and *sprinkling* of the blood of Jesus’ (1 Peter i. 12).

“Josephus and Philo also wrote in the time of our Savior and the Apostles, and they speak of *sprinkling alone* as the rite or symbol of purification in their times. And Josephus was a Pharisee—a priest and a very learned man, and from these facts we may infer that he would have been very particular to give *all the forms*. We also read in John iii. 25, 26, that there arose a question among the Jews about purifying—the disciples of John were all Jews, consequently this question was among Jews and about Jewish purification, and that purification was connected with the baptism of John and of the disciples of Jesus. And now let me ask a question. Could Jews who thus wrote and spoke about the application of blood and of water by *sprinkling*, find in *sprinkling* no due signification of purification?”

“I think the question answers itself,” said Anna, “after the considerations which have already been suggested. I have now but one more difficulty, and that is found in the prepositions *ἐν* and *εἰς*.”

“I am of the opinion,” said Brother Burton, “that these particles are not so easily managed. I am sure that *ἐν* means *in*, in Greek as much as *in* does in English, and that *εἰς* means *into*, in Greek just as much as *into* does in English.”

“It cannot be that you are a Greek scholar or you would not assert what is so easily proven to be false,” said Halley. “You say that *ἐν* and *εἰς* mean *in* and *into* invariably; now, George, you can read Greek well enough to decide this matter. Take your Greek Testament and turn to passages as I name them, and tell Brother Burton what prepositions are used. Matt. v. 1, ‘Christ went up *into* a mountain.’”

“It is *εἰς τὸ ὄρος* (*eis to oros*); *εἰς* before the noun mountain,” said George, “though it is not to be believed that he literally went *into* the mountain, but only *on* or *upon* it.”

“Matt. v. 34, ‘Swear not at all, neither *by* heaven for it is God’s throne.’”

“That is ἐν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (*en to ourano*); ἐν heaven,” said George. “Our Baptist version would make it read, ‘Swear not at all *in heaven*’ — a sensible construction, I must confess.”

“Matt. v. 35, ‘Nor *by* the earth, neither *by* Jerusalem.’”

“It is ἐν τῇ γῆ and εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα (*en te ge* and *eis herosoluma*), ἐν earth, and εἰς Jerusalem; but I should suppose that it was more reasonable to swear *by* the earth than *in* it; and I don’t know how they would swear *into* Jerusalem, unless, like a barbarian Gentile, they stood on the outside of the wall and swore over it, *into* the city!”

“Matt. v. 36, ‘Neither *by* thy head.’”

“There ἐν occurs again,” continued George; “but it certainly should not be rendered *in*, for it would make no sense.”

“Matt. vi. 34, ‘Take no thought *for* the morrow.’”

“There we have εἰς τῆν αὔριον (*eis ten aurion*); εἰς the morrow,” said George; “but it can’t mean *into* the morrow, for that would be an unnecessary precaution.”

“Matt. vii. 2, ‘For *with* what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged, and *with* what measure ye mete,’ etc.”

“The *with* is ἐν in both places,” said George, laughing, “I was thinking how some of our Baptist clergy (glancing his eyes toward Father Longwind) would look measured up after that fashion, for *in* what measure ye mete, and *in* what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged.”

“Matt. vii. 6, ‘Cast not your pearls before swine, lest they trample them *under* their feet.’”

“Ἐν τοῖς ποσίν (*en tois posin*); ἐν their feet,” said George; “but I believe I shall decide the other way this time, for if they should happen to get them *in* their feet, they’d be as likely again to turn and rend you. But it would bring out the force much better if it had been rendered ‘lest they trample them *with* their feet,’ etc.”

“Matt. xii. 41, ‘They repented *at* the preaching of Jonas.’”

“It is εἰς, but they certainly could not have repented *into* his preaching.”

“Luke xi. 49, ‘I will send them prophets and Apostles,’ etc.”

“It is *εἰς* them,” said George, looking up from his Testament, and turning his eyes towards Brother Burton; “I suppose Brother Burton would translate it, ‘I will send *into* them prophets and Apostles.’”

“John xi. 38, ‘Jesus therefore groaning in himself cometh *to* the grave.’”

“’*Εἰς* the grave, but not *into* it, certainly, for the stone was yet on the mouth of it.”

“John xxi. 4, ‘Jesus stood *on* the shore.’”

“’*Εἰς* the shore,” said George, “but not *into* the shore of course, for it would make the veriest nonsense.”

“Thus you are able to decide from a few examples taken at random,” said Halley, “whether it be true that *ἐν* and *εἰς* mean *in* and *into* in Greek as much as *in* and *into* do in English. I have also just finished a careful and written rendering of the Epistle of Paul to the Philippians, and in this epistle *εἰς* occurs twenty-three times, and in *not one* instance would it bring out the sense or force of the passage to render it *into*, nor is it thus rendered in a *single instance* in our (King James’) translation.

“The question is not whether they do not *sometimes* mean *in* and *into*; that all scholars admit, but that they invariably, or even in Hellenistic Greek — that of the New Testament — generally mean *in* and *into*, no scholar admits or believes. Yesterday I took up a Baptist publication in which this thing was stated just as Brother Burton repeated it, and he is probably indebted to this work for his information on this subject. To say the least of such statements, it shows a culpable ignorance on the matter in question, or a wilful perversion of the truth; authors, like the one referred to, can take which horn of the dilemma they choose.”

“And these words are used in connection with the word baptize?” remarked Anna.

“Yes,” replied Halley; “and where it says in Matthew that

Jesus when he was baptized went up straightway *out of* the water, it reads in the original, *from* the water. Brother Burton, turn to it if you please in Donnegan's Lexicon, and give us his definition. You know, you said, when we wish to determine the meaning of a Greek word, we must go to the Greek Dictionary, and that settles the matter at once."

Brother Burton took the Lexicon hesitatingly, and read, ἀπο (apo), *from, away from, etc.*

"Yes," said Halley, "ἀπο means in *all* Greek, *from, and away from*, this is really the only *primary* meaning of the word. If Christ had gone *into* the river, as you Baptists maintain, then we should have had instead of ἀνεβη ἀπο τοῦ ὕδατος (*anebe APO tou hudatos*), ἀνεβη ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος (*anebe EK tou hudatos*), which would have meant then primarily *from*, but secondarily, *etc., out of, from out of, etc.* Therefore, as ἐκ or (ἐξ) is not used in the original, we may safely say that it is as certain as language can make it, that only *departure from* the water is intended to be conveyed by the above passage in Greek as found in the original of both Matthew and Mark. In Mark we read in our translation, that 'Jesus was baptized of John *in* Jordan.' In the Greek it is ἐς the Jordan, the classical meaning of ἐς as given in their order in Donnegan's Lexicon, is *to, into, unto, towards, at, on, in, etc.*; and there are twenty-six significations as given by Schleusner, the great German Greek scholar. By observing the order, you will see, that as they are laid down even in Dictionaries of classic Greek, that *at* is a more probable rendering for ἐς, than *in*."

"I would like to know what the law is, by which translators are governed," said Anna, "in choosing the proper signification of words, where there are a great many to choose from, as in this case?"

"The subject treated of by the writer," responded Halley, "should be the most prominent; that is, what is he talking about, and what does he wish to say? and which one of these

significations, judging from the *subject matter* and *the context and its construction*, would bring out the most clearly and forcibly the idea in the mind of the writer? This idea is to be determined, then, by the *theme* of the discourse, the *context*—that which goes before, and that which follows—and by the *construction* of the sentence; and these *combined*, are to determine always the choice of the meaning of a word when a plurality of significations is given, as is generally the case. And this is the most difficult part of the whole field canvassed by the translator. It requires great insight into the nature, idiom, and peculiarities of the language, a nice discrimination of words and terms, a quick perception of slight shades of difference, a good judgment in balancing the effects and forces of these differences, a powerful concentration of thought, in thereby being able to keep the main idea or subject in the mind, and bringing everything to bear upon it; and last, but not least, good sound sense—common sense—so as not to make your author or writer say things that he never dreamed of, to make him rush heedlessly and recklessly into the most foolish inconsistencies and absurdities—as many, most certainly, make the Evangelists and the Apostles involve themselves, by strenuously and obstinately supporting their own peculiar faith and views in violation of every law of language and construction, and in the very teeth of consistency and common sense.

“Now, then, in Matthew iii. 13, it is said, that ‘Jesus came to Jordan;’ in Mark i. 9—keeping in view our principles of construction and rendering ‘He was baptized of John at Jordan;’ and Matt. iii. 16, and Mark i. 10, that ‘He went up from the water;’ there is no conflicting in the original, as every classical scholar knows. In Matt. iii. 6, it reads, ‘Were baptized of him in Jordan;’ and so it is in Mark i. 5. But in the original, *ἐν* is used; and we have learned that *ἐν* may mean *with* and *at*, &c., as well as *in*; and it might here with much more propriety be rendered *at*, as thereby it harmonizes with other

passages; and moreover, it is only used here to indicate the place where the ordinance was performed. Nothing is more common in both Latin and Greek, than to render the same preposition *to* and *into*; and also *in* and *at*; for example, in such passages as these; he came *into* the city—he came *to* the village—he came *to* the river; and also he stopped *in* the city—he stopped *at* the village—and he stopped *at* the river. The same preposition answers for *to* and *into*, and the same for *at* and *in*, in both Greek and Latin, as every one, who knows anything about these languages, must admit. We have also found that Luke, in giving the same account as the one referred to—the baptism of Jesus—used a phraseology that would not admit, at all, of the rendering *in the water*: and our Savior, too, in speaking of John's baptism, and subsequently Peter, in speaking of the same, used like phraseology, from which no *IN THE WATER* can possibly be drawn. Is it not fair and *safe*, then, to infer that Matthew, Mark and John, meant *with water* also? There is no violation of any principle or law of interpretation in thus rendering it: it *must of necessity* be thus translated, as this is the only way the different accounts can be harmonized. And would our Baptist friends, rather than give up their untenable and preconceived notions of this subject, *insist* that one party did not know what they were talking about? Will they thus accuse their Lord and Master? There is but one other passage where apparently our version affords ground for immersion, and that is John iii. 23, 'And John also was baptizing in Ænon, near to Salim, because there was *much water* there.' The original reads ὕδατα πολλά (*hudata polla*). Brother Burton, will you turn to it in Robinson's Lexicon, and give us the definition?"

Brother Burton said that he guessed they wan't particular about it; but on being urged, took the Lexicon and read, ὕδατα πολλά, *many fountains* or *springs*, ὕδωρ *water*, and the plural ὕδατα, *waters*, πολλά, *many*; hence, *many waters*, that is, *fountains* or *springs*."

“It means then,” said Halley, “that he was baptizing *in* Ænon, or rather *at* Ænon (as the *ἐν* here should be rendered), because there were many fountains or springs here, and nothing more. In corroboration of this we are informed by those best acquainted with the topography of the place, in as far as they can determine its locality, that there is *no place* anywhere in that section of the country where there is much water. In the case of Philip and the Ethiopian eunuch, the original reads the same as it does in Mark i. 10, and Matt. iii. 16, with the exception of the preposition *ἐκ*, *from*, *out of*, etc.; but as the primary signification of *ἐκ* is *from*, as given in Donnegan’s Lexicon (the standard of our Baptist friends), it is in reality no exception, and fully harmonizes with the *form* or *mode* of administering the rite gathered from the Evangelists. If you are not satisfied, George, you can look at the definition of it.”

“I have examined it before,” replied George; “and the primary meaning of *ἐκ* is *from*, and the order, as given by Donnegan, is *from*, *out of*, *from out of*, *away from*, etc.”

“Then it reads in the original,” continued Halley, “they went down *to* and came up *from* the water.”

“Is it not getting late?” inquired Brother Burton, stretching his limbs to their utmost tension, and hanging his thumbs wearily in the arm-holes of his vest; but there was a look in his eye indicating anything rather than the wooings of the gentle god Morpheus.

“It is eleven,” said Halley, consulting his watch; “indeed I was not aware of its being so late: I fear I have wearied you beyond excuse.”

“Do not speak of being wearied,” said Anna, “I could listen forever to the explanations of these truths, if it would require forever to explain them.”

CHAPTER VI.

“The morn is up again, the dewy morn,
With breath all incense, and with cheek all bloom,
Laughing the clouds away with playful scorn,
And living as if earth contained no tomb, —
And glowing into day; we may resume
The march of our existence; may find room
And food for meditation, nor pass by
Much that may give us pause, if pondered fittingly.”

ALMOST before the stars paled on the morrow, Elder Clayton entered his study, seated himself in his chair — his old arm-chair — and elevating his feet to the window-sill, was soon lost in a perplexing maze of thought. He had not rested well the night before. Every half-hour, until long after the “short ones” came, Mother Clayton aroused him from his dozing to say, that she “would bet anything, if she was in the habit of betting, that that college madcap would entice the girl from their church and communion!” And as many times as this was uttered, Elder Clayton tried to persuade himself that if *she was really convinced* that some other way was right, he would try to be reconciled to her enjoying her own opinions — but as many times he failed. Mother Clayton at last worked herself up to the denunciation that, “If he did entice her away, he might make off with her, for she didn’t want any *sprinkled* Christians round her!” — thus solacing herself, she went to sleep; but it only added to the Elder’s sleeplessness and unrest.

And now, after a troubled night, he had again, in the silence of his study, resumed the train of thought which so greatly disturbed his usual equanimity. It seemed to him if he was not an Elder, having the charge of a church — if he was only a lay member, he could get up more Christian resignation. Half dozing, and conning it over for the twentieth time, the door gently opened and Brother Burton entered.

“I thought I heard you up, Brother,” he said, stepping quickly towards him; “I want to talk with you — perhaps it would be well enough to turn the key, so we won’t be interrupted. Now, Brother Clayton, what do you think of this matter — it really assumes an unpleasant shape, don’t it?”

“Why, yes,” said Elder Clayton, thoughtfully. “The effect of this on my children is what I fear! It robbed me of my sleep last night — I was thinking of what the consequences *might* be, of having such doctrines brought in contact with their young minds. When one gets older, and has his principles *fixed*, as yours and mine are, Brother Burton, then he is not blown off the track so easily; but I fear for them — I fear it will not only disturb the peace of my family, but possibly divide it forever!”

“Yes, yes; O of course you can’t be expected, if the girl persists in believing such strange doctrines in defiance of your expressed desires, counsel, Bible teachings, and everything, that you can have that regard for her you would have if she were dutiful and obedient,” said Brother Burton. “Let me see; she’s a girl you’ve taken to bring up — she’s not your own daughter, Elder?”

“No,” he replied, “I don’t believe there’s a drop of Baptist blood in her veins, or she would’nt be so obstinate about the matter. It seems so strange to me — now I’ve been trying to think what reason there is in it — they acknowledge that our way is *good, valid*, and all that; then what reason is there in one member of a family bolting away from the rest, and dividing

the house? When they acknowledge our way is a good one, why can't they go with us, if they do think some other way is good too? They acknowledge our way is good; I should suppose they would all go in for immersion so as to be *sure* they're right!" The good man was almost bewildered by his own subtle reasoning; but he started with a profound consciousness on his own part of the ungratefulness of the Christian world in general, and of Anna in particular, in not acknowledging the superior merit of that *form*, that quite a fraction of the Christian community held to, as the *only form*, while others admitted it to be, perhaps, of equal merit with other forms for which they, strange to say, had a preference.

"I suspect," said Brother Burton, rubbing his hands with quiet glee, "it's the *close communion* they don't fancy—it's because we won't fellowship them and their baby-sprinkling, and all—that's it! I believe I'll challenge Halley on that subject: I consider their *baby-sprinkling* altogether indefensible!"

"But you don't yield this other argument so easily—do you?" asked Elder Clayton, with an anxious look in his eye.

"O, on baptism? why, no! The truth is I don't think I've had any argument at all! I thought I would let him do the talking last night, as he seemed to relish it so well; but I've got it all arranged now; I intend to come down on him; to *deny* with some of our Baptist *thunder*!—his position is altogether untenable."

"I am glad to hear you say so, really, Brother; I was expecting a good deal from you—I thought it couldn't be possible that I should be so sadly disappointed. Then Anna will yet be convinced and go on with us in peace and harmony, and George, too—I have had my fears about him."

"I can't answer for the girl," replied Brother Burton, "I rather suspect she intends to believe as this young man believes, whether she is convinced or not, for reasons best known to her-

self, perhaps! Didn't you notice last night how she set herself up as an umpire to judge of the weight of argument, and invariably came out on his side? One would have thought it more modest and maidenly to have made fewer remarks herself, and referred to you, Brother Clayton, or to some other one better able to judge, and have been governed accordingly. I think if she had been a daughter of mine, I would have reproved her sharply."

Elder Clayton did not reply to this. He knew in his heart that Anna was seeking truth, and that too from no impure motive. He also knew, that as she was the one for whom the argument was pending, her remarks, her decision of points after hearing the testimony on either side, her expression of opinion and judgment, was not at all out of the way, or even unmaidenly; but his Brother's remarks suggested to him a new idea. Anna was shrinkingly sensitive, and if worse came to worse, perhaps a little paternal authority might accomplish what argument would not; at least, it would do to think about, and so the two separated.

Breakfast being over, the young people gathered around the centre-table in the sitting-room, and were engaged in reading when Brother Burton entered with his two clerical friends from a walk in the garden, where he had been giving them an outline of the argument he intended to bring forward; and seating themselves now with much assurance, Brother Burton at once introduced the subject of the day, and commenced the attack, as if expecting an easy victory, with scarcely a rejoinder from his young opponent.

"Mr. Halley, I think you asserted last night, that βαπτίζω was appropriated to a spiritual use: its significance must of necessity have been changed; but I think, sir, I can prove to you that it was first used in regard to water baptism, yes, for years before the Spirit baptism was bestowed upon the world. One was instituted at the commencement of the mission of Christ, and the other

at its close; hence, it could not be said to have been spiritualized at the time the ordinance of water baptism was instituted; neither can we suppose that there is *literally* any Spirit baptism. I think it undeniable, that the word was used only as a *figure* to convey an idea of the overwhelming abundance of its influences; — that these influences should cover, overpower, and swallow up their minds, as the water did the bodies of the subjects in baptism. It could have been used only as a figure; for the Holy Spirit *cannot be literally* poured out or sprinkled, neither could the disciples be *literally* immersed in Him, any more than they already had been, for He is and always was everywhere present, and had always surrounded them at every side. It is clearly impossible, then, that there could have been any literal baptism of the Spirit in any sense of the word, either by sprinkling, pouring, or immersion. Baptism, in other places, is represented as an overwhelming of the soul in great and intense afflictions. Are you able, said Christ, to be plunged deep into afflictions, and have sorrow cover you as water? That, too, which was a baptism of suffering was a metaphorical, and not a literal, baptism; so he told his disciples, that in a few days they should be immersed or overwhelmed by the influences of the Holy Spirit.”

During this harangue, Halley sat with his eyes fixed in a quiet gaze on the face of the speaker, and when he paused for a reply, Halley quietly said, “May I ask for what purpose you seek this controversy?”

Brother Burton thinking this a ruse to evade the point, and fearing lest he should be cheated out of his expected triumph, replied: “Why I have been informed that our young friend here, Miss Anna, is investigating this subject, and as you stated what I can’t help regarding as altogether unwarrantable, I desire to resume the discussion.”

“Let me refer you, then, with your objections, to Miss Anna herself,” said Halley, “and let her examine them on Scriptural evidences”

A pair of black eyes flashed, but there was no way of getting round it without positive rudeness, and so with a bad grace the question was submitted to her. Anna colored slightly, and replied: "If it were not for two or three difficulties, it would look very plausible, and might be received as a solution of this much-controverted question."

"What are they?" Brother Burton very testily inquired.

"In the first place," responded Anna, "in the first account we have of water baptism as instituted by John, he says he instituted it *because* there was One coming after him who should baptize with the Holy Spirit; here we discover an intimate connection between them, and when Christ came to him, and submitted to the ordinance, then the Holy Ghost fell on him; and here we find an account of water baptism and Spirit baptism side by side, and both on the person of our blessed Master and Savior. That it *literally* fell on him, we *know*, because God's truth asserts it, and God cannot lie; and afterward it is stated that Jesus 'returned from Jordan *full of the Holy Ghost*, and it led him into the wilderness;' and Peter says in Acts x. 38, 'God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power.' And John says of Christ, 'God gave not the Spirit by measure unto him.' Therefore I do not find that one was instituted years before the other; but on the contrary, we received the warrant for both at the same time. And how Jesus received one which was the *substance*, of which the other was the shadow, we are not left in doubt either. No one can question the mode of the Spirit baptism, 'for it descended upon him in the form of a dove.' It was not said to surround and envelop him, so that he could be, indeed, immersed in it, or even said to be immersed in it; 'but it descended and abode upon him,' just as it afterward fell on all them that believed on the day of Pentecost, 'there appeared cloven tongues like as of fire that *sat* upon *each* of them.' That he should be buried under the water, to symbolize the Spirit's descending and

abiding upon him, looks to me like an absurdity—it would be no symbol at all. I have searched,” she continued, “for a baptism of suffering, but have not been able to find it——”

“What!” interrupted Brother Burton, not being able longer to restrain his impatience, “what, not find it? You must have been a superficial reader, indeed! Turn to Matthew xx. 22–23, and perhaps you will find what you have been so long in quest of: it stands there so plain that you *may* find it, if you are not so blind you *can't* see it!”

Anna's lip quivered, but she summoned up courage enough to reply, “I have read that many times, Elder Burton; but it must be that I am blind, for I can see no baptism of suffering there.”

“Did you ever see such stubbornness?” said Brother Burton, glancing his flashing eyes toward Elder Clayton, and speaking in his bitterest tones, and with a petulance which showed of what stuff he was made; “I suppose if we should assure her it was there, she would still persist in telling us it was not to be seen!”

Anna was completely crushed, and if her life depended on it, could not have answered another word. Halley started to his feet, and paced quickly up and down the room, and then stopping short before Brother Burton, said, “Elder Burton, you are a minister of the Gospel, and as such, entitled to respect; but no man, whether he be priest or king, has a right to crush down the minds of others. We are created reasoning beings: it is natural for us to ask a *reason* for what we are required to believe, and as a teacher, you need not expect your simple assertion to convince of truth. I take up the gauntlet thrown down at her, and reply that though you, and Elder Clayton, and Father Longwind, and as many more theologians as could utter their assertions from now until the day of doom, should protest that it is so, still I will not believe it, unless it can be shown to be so, from the word of God.”

Brother Burton said that he did not intend to be rude to Miss Clayton; he was apt to be hasty in debate, and begged the lady's pardon; but when anything was so plain and self-evident, as the passage referred to, for people to persist that they could not see it, looked, to him, like sheer obstinacy."

Halley replied that if he would examine the passage more carefully, he would find that what he believed to be self-evident, needed proof; and he would further discover that the *onus probandi*—the burden of proof—lay on his own shoulders. It was not so easy to believe that a baptism "*I am already* baptized with," meant the deep and intense sufferings he would *in future time* meet with near, and at, the close of his mission. "Read it," said Halley, "and see who has been the superficial reader; and as for your assertion that Spirit baptism was a *mere figure of speech*, that, too, needs proof before it will be believed. If it was used as a *figure*, why was not the figure carried out? But not a single example can you point to where the Spirit baptism is represented as overwhelming or immersing an individual—not one! If it is used as a figure, where is your figure? For you to say that it *probably means* that the Spirit's influences are to cover, overpower, and swallow up their minds, is to make a figure of your own; it is not found in the word of God. They are said 'to be full of the Holy Ghost,' and 'to be led by it—filled with it,' etc.; but the quantity received, or what it led them to do, was not called a baptism; it was the *act of receiving it* that was thus named, and that *act* is distinctly specified again and again: 'It descended upon them, was poured out, it fell, was shed forth'—where is your immersion? Your assertion that it *must* be a *figure of speech* because, forsooth, according to your opinion *it could not be a literal baptism*, is in direct contradiction of the word of God—and may God be the judge in this matter—and judge betwixt you and us! You might as well *make a figure of speech* of heaven or hell! and behold the Bible would be nothing but *figures of speech*, save the dipping in

water, called by our Baptist friends the *only* true baptism! Is nothing *real* but what is material? Strictly speaking, nothing is *real* but what is *spiritual*! The material crumbles to dust between our fingers—it will all pass away! If we attempt to grasp it, it disappoints and deceives us; but the spiritual is imperishable, unchanging in substance, and immortal—as lasting and abiding as eternity—it shall endure whilst God himself endures! Especially is this true of God's ordinances; for the material is used *invariably* as a type of the spiritual. Not one exception can you point to—not one, as either revealed from Mount Sinai, or set forth in the teachings of Christ and the Apostles. Then by what authority do you put the outward rite as the substance, and the inward or spiritual as a *mere figure of speech*?

“This was the great error and guilt of the Jews. They were so absorbed by a punctilious observance of *outward forms*, as to forget the very things they were designed to teach and impress. And the prophets, by the command of God, denounced a wo against them for so doing: ‘Wo to Ariel, to Ariel, the city where David dwelt; add ye year to year, let them *kill sacrifices*, yet I will distress Ariel. Forasmuch as this people draw near me with their mouth, and with their lips do honor me, but have removed their hearts far from me, and their fear toward me, is taught by the precepts of men.’ And our Savior repeated the wo: ‘Wo unto you, scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites, for ye pay tithe of mint, anise, and cummin, but have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and truth.’”

“I think you are rather severe, young man,” said Brother Burton, nettling under the sharp rebuke.

“It is but the severity of truth,” Halley replied; “how else can I understand you: if you do not make water baptism the *substance*, of what is it a shadow? Is it the shadow of a *figure of speech*?”

“But you expressly said that water baptism was first insti-

tuted, and then, the idea involved in that was used as a *figure*, thus making the outward rite the substance, and the spiritual rite its type or shadow. But if you should insist that water baptism is *not* the substance implied, but a shadow — behold then a shadow of a shadow!”

“I think I understand it,” said Father Longwind. “Water baptism, at the time it was instituted, had no reference to what is called Spirit baptism, but was a figure of the death and resurrection of Christ, and also of our own death and resurrection, but *afterward* it was appropriated as a figure of the other baptism.”

“Where is your proof?” asked Halley.

“Why you know Paul says,” continued Father Longwind—
“‘Buried with him by baptism into death.’ Is not that conclusive evidence?”

“If you mean death,” responded Halley, “there is certainly no similitude between being put under water, and being hung upon a cross, between the heavens and the earth, to die.”

“No, no; his burial, I mean:” said Father Longwind.

“Very well, then; let me ask who it was that used this figure?”

“Why Paul, to be sure.”

“And he was a Jew?”

“Yes, certainly.”

“Then let me ask, how did the Jews dispose of their dead?”

“How? why——”

“In sepulchres,” interrupted George. “They were vaults or rooms dug out in the solid rocks—or perchance sometimes natural caverns—they were large enough for a whole family. The dead were generally embalmed, and also wrapped, and laid in sepulchres.”

“So we read,” continued Halley, “that Jesus was *not buried*, but laid in a sepulchre, and a great stone rolled to the mouth of it. This is a bad figure, so far; for being laid in a sepulchre

is no more like being plunged under water, than your being laid upon that sofa would be like it."

"I do'nt see why it an't," said Brother Burton. "These were dark vaults, and when the stone was rolled to the mouth of it the dead would be literally enclosed, as though they were buried under the ground—in the '*heart of the earth*,' as the Scriptures speak of Christ's burial."

"Anna," said Halley, "go close the door and shut to the blinds, and then let us imagine that we are *literally* buried, as much so as if we were in our coffins, and six feet of earth on our bosoms! Who would not laugh at us, or consider us insane, if we persisted in maintaining such an idea? But who was Paul talking to?—the Jews?"

"No, to the Romans," replied Father Longwind. "This is in his Epistle to the Romans."

"Then perhaps the Romans buried their dead," said Halley, and would understand the figure, even if Paul himself did not?"

"No," said George; "every schoolboy knows, who knows much of anything, that both the Greeks and the Romans consumed the bodies of their dead with fire on the funeral pile, and gathered the ashes into an urn to keep as a sacred relic—burying as we do was, generally, if not entirely, unknown among them."

"Worse and worse," said Halley. "Paul told the Romans that their being plunged under water by baptism, was a type of being burned to ashes on a funeral pile after they were dead! What a beautiful, appropriate, and forcible figure is this! Behold here was a man, inspired by the Spirit of God to talk more consistently, forcibly and truly, than other men, using a figure that would be scouted in a public speaker, and from which a mere tyro in the knowledge of language would turn in disgust! How I would like to see a Baptist version of the Bible! But here truly is a *bad shadow*, which they know not how to dispose of! They have got the length, breadth, height,

and depth—in fact, all the dimensions—of this shadow fully determined; but the great difficulty is, to find a *substance* corresponding to it. They hang fast hold of the *shadow*, thinking that thereby they must be on the track of something, and they first measure it alongside one thing and then of another; but most unfortunately this is too long, that too short, this too broad, and that too narrow! What will our Baptist friends do with their shadow?"

"I think your ridicule, instead of falling on the Baptists, falls on Paul, who wrote the Epistle," said Father Longwind. "It looks to me, young man, like daring impiety, to speak thus of the inspired word of God!"

"Mistaken again," said Halley, "Paul wrote no such inconsistent meaningless sentence as you ascribe to him. On the contrary, everything that fell from his lips or pen, was rich with thought and appropriateness."

"What do *you* make of it, then?" asked Elder Clayton, opening his eyes wide with wonder, at the shape the argument was taking.

"Precisely what Paul says," responded Halley. "I would not make anything else of it if I could. If it were simplified, it would read thus: like as Christ was insensible to the world, when dead, so we profess to the world by our baptism, to be dead to it also; and like as Christ was raised up from the dead, and continued for a time in the world, though not of the world, so we should walk in newness of life, living only unto God. Baptism—the word βαπτισματος (*baptismatos*)—is here used, simply because through it we profess to become dead to the world. The Apostle explains himself in the eleventh verse: 'Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, and alive unto God through our Lord Jesus Christ.' Baptism is, in this passage, used in a spiritual sense, and thereby it is in harmony with all the teachings of the New Testament. To illustrate this, Dr. Edward Beecher has very forcibly and properly

arranged parallel references to Christ and to the believer. He says: 'The sufferings of Christ are supposed to be fully before the mind, as an object of daily meditation and imitation, and that whatever took place naturally in connexion with the sufferings of Christ, has something to correspond with it spiritually in its connexion with the sufferings of believers. Thus:

CHRIST.

THE BELIEVER.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Christ suffered naturally. | 1. The believer suffers spiritually. |
| 2. Christ in the flesh, <i>i. e.</i> body natural. | 2. The believer in his flesh, <i>i. e.</i> body of sin. |
| 3. The members of Christ's body were crucified. | 3. The members of the body of sin are to be crucified. |
| 4. Christ's body died entirely. All natural life was totally extinct. | 4. The body of sin, the old man, the flesh, is to be entirely destroyed. |
| 5. Christ's natural death was for sin. | 5. The believer's spiritual death is to sin. |
| 6. Christ was buried naturally, and became invisible in the grave. | 6. The believer is to be buried spiritually, and to become invisible in his old character. |
| 7. Christ rose naturally, and appeared in new external glory. | 7. The believer is to rise spiritually, and appear in a new, holy glorious, spiritual character. |
| 8. It was the mighty natural power of God that raised Christ. | 8. It is the mighty power of God <i>through faith</i> that raises the believer. |
| 9. Christ after his resurrection sat down in heavenly places, bodily. | 9. Believers sit down <i>by faith</i> , in heavenly places, after their resurrection. |
| 10. Christ dies naturally no more; death hath no more dominion over him. | 10. Believers die in sin no more; death spiritual hath no more dominion over them.'" |

"I find the most difficulty with this verse," said Anna, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized *into* Jesus Christ, were baptized *into* his death?"

"Baptized *into* Jesus Christ and *into* his death," said Halley,

“is a poor rendering of the original *εἰς Χριστόν, Ἰησοῦν, εἰς τὸν θάνατον* (*eis Christon Iesoun eis ton thanaton*). Here occurs that little preposition *εἰς*, which instead of having been translated *into*, should have been rendered *to* or *unto*. We have before learned that it does not always mean *into* as our Baptist friends have asserted, but on the other hand has twenty-six significations; and it calls upon some of the other twenty-five to properly represent it, very much oftener than it does upon *into*; and here in this passage should have been represented in English by *unto*, as every classical scholar must admit. And then it would have read thus: ‘Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized unto Jesus Christ, were baptized unto his death;’ that is, with regard to the design of his death—the great leading purpose of his work—which was to expiate sin, to free men from its power, and to make them pure.”

“That is certainly satisfactory to me,” said Anna. “I have noted some other passages,” she continued, with a sidelong glance at Brother Burton, “that I would like to refer to; one is 1 Peter iii. 21, ‘The like figure whereunto baptism doth now save us, not the putting off the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God.’”

“There Peter expressly says that baptism doth save us,” said Halley; “but not the outward rite, which is a putting off the filth of the flesh, but the inward or spiritual operation, through which we are purified so as to live with a good conscience toward God.”

“Does not the Savior utter a like sentiment?” asked Anna, when he says, “‘Except a man be born of the water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.’”

“Yes, it has this force. Ye cannot enter into the kingdom of God by merely being purified with baptismal water, but ye must be sanctified and regenerated by the Spirit of God. This was said to a Jewish Rabbi. They, the Jews, had fallen into the error, that by the outward rite they were altogether purified and made clean, hence they had become whited sepulchres, as

Jesus told them, outwardly beautiful, but inwardly full of corruption. This idea of theirs Jesus many times rebuked, as he did in the words of the text you cited. And he labored to teach them that something beyond the outward rite was necessary to fit them to enter the kingdom of God."

"I have one passage more," said Anna: "it is in Eph. iv. 5. 'One Lord, one faith, and one baptism.'"

"If this refers to a *mode*," said Halley, "it refers to it in distinction from some other mode of baptism then in use, teaching that Christian baptism was different from something else of the same name, and so it can be turned against the advocates of immersion. If it implies a *mode*, it can furnish no aid to the immersionists, though they have always made free use of it in proselyting—but that it does, is not tenable ground by any means. If you observe the context, you will discover that the Apostle was exhorting them to unity, 'To keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace,' for he assured them that there was one body, one Spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and in you all, and through you all; hence with all meekness and long-suffering they should bear and forbear with each other in love. You will discover at once that it is the *ordinance* that is referred to, and the idea is that they have all had the same consecration to the Father, Son and Holy Ghost in the ordinance of baptism. If there had been half a dozen different modes, his phraseology would still have been 'one baptism,' *i. e.* one consecration. But in Heb. vi. 2, the Apostle speaks of the doctrine of *baptisms*: here the plural is used, *baptisms*, but it evidently means that of water and of the Holy Spirit, the first as a type of the second; for we have no account of other baptisms, which may be considered as belonging to the doctrines our Savior taught, or to his Church. The Apostle was exhorting them 'to leave the principles of the doctrines of Christ,' which were 'the doctrine of baptisms and laying on of hands,' etc."

Brother Burton here started up and declared he was sure of one thing—that many eminent Presbyterian divines, and others, had admitted that immersion was the apostolic mode of baptism, and if they had'nt found evidences to sustain their sprinkling he did'nt see how anybody else could."

Halley smiled and said that he was ready to admit for the sake of argument—although the facts in the case, as found in the Bible testimony, created no such necessity, as they must be willing to acknowledge, he thought, by that time; but still, just for the sake of argument, he would admit that John baptized by the immersion of the whole body in the river Jordan, that Jesus himself was thus baptized, and subsequently that the Apostles thus baptized their converts; yet he could find sufficient evidence in the nature of the ordinance to convince him or any sane man who would view the matter candidly, that that particular form was not essential to the ordinance—just as many an eminent divine had before him, and thinking such evidence sufficient had sought for no other.

Father Longwind laughed outright, and thought beyond dispute the young man was mad. "What, admit all we claim as to the form, and then prove that it can be administered in some other way—impossible!"

"Brother Burton snapped his eyes and fingers in eagerness for the contest, thinking if he was to have his own ground to work on, there could be no question as to the result. And even Anna doubted the propriety of the position.

"Permit me," said Halley, "to ask, how we are to obey the commands of Christ? Are we to obey the full letter—that is *literally*, or obey simply the *spirit* of those commands?"

"*Literally*, of course," exclaimed Elder Burton, with the greatest assurance.

"May I ask if you do 'of course,' obey his commands in that way?"

"Certainly, this is what I intend to do. If Christ was im-

mersed, then when we are commanded to repent and to be baptized, we are of course commanded to repent and to be *immersed*, and if we do anything else we do not obey, and it is not baptism."

"But you do not claim this command to be an exception—one single exception—to all the other commands of Christ, *i. e.* that it *alone* is to be obeyed literally, and all the others simply in the Spirit or substantial part of them?"

"No, of course not; I mentioned this as an example. All of the commands of Christ should be obeyed fully, both in the letter and in the Spirit."

"Yes, that is the position I expected you to take. Then when Christ says, 'After this manner pray ye,' he gives an *express* command, and a *very definite form*—the form is carried out from beginning to end; and, according to your position taken in respect to baptism, when you are commanded to pray, you are expected to repeat this form, and if you repeat any other it is not prayer."

"O no, no, that can't be!"

"Can't be? It is the necessary result of your own reasoning. Christ also went up into a mountain and continued all night in prayer; he also fell on his face and prayed; do you imitate him in this respect as well as in baptism? Christ also says 'Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, nor yet for your body what ye shall put on.' Here too is an *express* command which not only cuts off the anxiety of a clergyman looking after his salary, but also *all* of the now considered laudable seeking for the comforts of life. Do you keep these express commands literally as well as in the Spirit, Brother Burton?"

"O, I understand this to mean," said Brother Burton, "not to make these thoughts for life the chief and predominant object of our care, to the exclusion of God."

"Ah! this is what you *understand* it to mean, and I suppose

you would understand that this form of prayer was only to teach us what it is proper to pray for, and with what spirit we should come?"

"Certainly; certainly, we can't suppose that Christ intended to limit every Christian, from that age to this, to this prayer and to this only."

"Then let me beg of you to consider for a moment what liberty you are taking with the *express* commands of Christ. Christ says do thus and so—every part of the act being distinctly specified, and yet you, a Baptist too, who believes in *literal obedience*, assume to say that it is your opinion that Christ did not intend to limit you to just such and such precise forms and acts which he specifies, but only that you should obey their spirit. You say, if you come to God in prayer with a consciousness of the perfection of his attributes, trusting to his Fatherly care for all good, both temporal and spiritual, forgiving others as you hope to be forgiven, and with submission to his divine will, that thus you have truly and in the most acceptable manner obeyed this command of Christ regarding prayer; more truly, perhaps, than if you had employed his words to express those feelings. Also that it *is* your duty to take thought for life, for 'he who provideth not for his own household is worse than an infidel,' and also we are commanded 'to be diligent in business,' as well as 'fervent in spirit,' and as a consequence you conclude that Christ did not mean *exactly* what he said, 'That you shall take *no* thought for the morrow or for life,' provided you will take more thought for God."

"Why, yes; I believe it is universally conceded that some such things as these are not to be obeyed *literally*: perhaps I expressed myself loosely when I said that *all* the commands of Christ were to be obeyed literally, I should have said the greater part of them."

"Then you concede that it *would be decidedly inconvenient* to obey literally in *all* things; but what mark has Christ left on

those he intends to have literally obeyed? They should have some kind of badge, or else there would be a liability to mistake! Let us look up some more, and see if we can discover any distinguishing mark! Christ told his disciples when they went out to preach, 'to provide neither silver nor gold, nor brass for their purses, nor yet scrip for their journey, neither two coats, nor shoes, for the workman is worthy of his hire.' This I presume you will not hesitate to put down in the class *not literal*, because it would be a decidedly inconvenient manner of traveling; and also, 'When thou fastest anoint thy head,' etc., — 'and when a man compels you to go one mile, go with him two; and when one takes away your coat, give him your cloak also; and when a man smites you on one cheek, turn to him the other also;' all these, you will say, clearly belong to the *not literal*!

"But here is one. After Jesus had washed their feet, and taken his garments, and was set down again, he said unto his disciples, 'I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done unto you.' Whatever you may say of the others, this has beyond question the *appearance* of belonging to the class of *literals*. He gave an example, and an example is given for the purpose of being followed. May I ask Brother Burton how often he has washed the feet of his brethren in obedience to this command of his Master?"

Brother Burton evidently annoyed, hesitatingly replied that he thought that example was given to teach us humility.

"It may be inconvenient or unfashionable," said Halley; "but nevertheless Christ says, 'I have given you an example that you should do as I have done unto you;' and he who pretends to a *literal obedience*, and yet overlooks so important, express, and plainly given command of his Master as this, can hardly expect others to give him the credit of believing what he himself declares he believes with regard to literal obedience."

"I think," said Brother Burton, "that literal obedience

should be limited to the ordinances of the church — baptism, and the Lord's Supper. They certainly should be literally observed, just as Christ and his disciples observed them. And we should not know that these ordinances were proper and acceptable to God, unless they had either been enjoined or practised: so whatever is connected with them, both as it regards the subject and the mode, must receive the same sanction; and to depart in the least respect from the manner in which they were originally practised, changes the whole nature of the institution, and converts an ordinance of God into the mere will worship of man. A church which does not keep these two ordinances pure, cannot be said to be a gospel church."

"Let me repeat your position as now taken," said Halley; "and if I am not mistaken, it is precisely the same as that taken by '*the great expounder of Baptist orthodoxy*,' a Southern editor and author; and by it, the literal interpretation is limited to the ordinances of the church. Our Baptist brethren have discovered the great secret pass-word or sign, by which this important truth is made known, by which their brethren of other denominations are in commiserated ignorance, and in consequence of their superior knowledge, have decided that to depart in the *least respect* from the manner in which these ordinances were originally practised, changes the whole nature of the institution, and converts an ordinance of God into the mere *will worship* of man. Now let us examine the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, remembering we are not to depart in the *least respect* from the original manner. They assembled in an upper room (Luke xxii. 12). They reclined on the usual sofa or couch on which the ancients reposed at their meals (John xiii. 23-25). It was night (John xiii. 30). They ate unleavened bread, such as was used in the Passover (Ex. xii. 19). The wine they drank was that of Palestine — a red wine. It was kept in leathern bottles. It was served in peculiar vessels. The bread was made in a particular fashion. The clothes of

the guests were of a certain form. Yet Christ said, 'Do this in remembrance of me.' And you say, Brother Burton, that to depart in the *least respect* from the manner in which this ordinance was instituted, changes the whole nature of the institution, and converts an ordinance of God into mere *will worship* of man! Let us now enter a Baptist church at the Communion season. There is *nothing* like the original institution when the twelve gathered around their Lord, either in time, place, surroundings, manner of the ordinance, or material used—nothing to remind one of it, except the mere *act* of breaking bread and pouring out of wine. Everything else is changed. There was there no exclusiveness—some of Christ's followers saying to others, Stand aside, for we are holier than thou. There were none of Christ's sorrowing children there, crowded into one corner *looking on*, but *not partaking*. There were no ladies there to share the smiles of their Lord. All—all is changed—how changed! Have not then our Baptist friends departed in the *least respect* from the very original manner of the ordinance? By your own judgment you are judged and condemned. According to your own reasoning, *you* are not a gospel church! But again, Jesus said, 'This is my body, and this is my blood, which is shed for you.' If our Baptist friends are *sure* this ordinance has a *literal* interpretation, then consequently here is a literal transmutation into the *real* body and blood of Jesus Christ; and as a necessary sequence of their own reasoning, they partake of the real body and blood of their Lord, whenever they approach his table. It seems to me that they might sympathize fully on this point with their Roman Catholic neighbors, as they imagine others might with them in the form of baptism."

"We don't believe any such thing," said Brother Burton. "We don't believe in transubstantiation any more than you do."

"But you should—you should most assuredly believe in it, if you have faith in your own reasoning; or have you discovered

by this invisible sign spoken of—visible only to a few of the most enlightened Baptist eyes—that only *parts* of these ordinances are to be literal, and *just such* parts too as it shall please you to name? By what authority do you say that this, that, and the other thing, which will twist the Bible into conformity to your creed, are *literal*, and everything else *figurative, metaphorical, or exceedingly ambiguous*, and hard to be understood? At first we have an assertion that all the express commands of Christ are to be *literally obeyed*; but discovering the absurdity of this position, you beat a retreat into the larger fraction of them, and then still further, into the church and its ordinances, just as though every command of Christ was not a rule to govern the life of the members of his body! But we follow you there—into the ordinances—even into the two citadels of Baptist faith, and we learn that your embankments are but the drifting sand, and your cannon voiceless phantoms! Even your own reasonings, your own guns disturb you as much as your enemies, and between arranging the one and the dodging of the other, you have a sorry time of it, indeed!

“It would not look well to say that only *one*—just one single command of our Savior was to be obeyed in the letter, and all the rest regarded simply in their spirit, and that too without being able to point out the difference in phraseology or design between this and the other, so as to satisfactorily account for the difference in the interpretation; and consequently you throw out a remark which may mean much or little, not at all definite in its limitation, but varying according to the concessions of each individual mind, and all for the purpose of covering up this exceedingly limited limitation. The truth is, you yourselves do not pretend to literal obedience except in the ordinance of baptism—this one single ordinance—although in your theory you throw out a general remark to make believe you have an abundance of the kind in reserve, and simply speak of that by way of example! Take down your false colors, and

talk just what you practise—just what you believe! You *know* you do not *literally* keep any of the commands of Christ—not even the one ordinance of the Lord's Supper!"

"I think," said Father Longwind, "that we shall have to concede this point, we can do it with all safety; but as to the other,—that of baptism,—we will stick to *it* as long as we are Baptists."

"Yes," responded Halley, "you *must* stick to that, or you cease to be Baptists. But now look at the consistency of the matter. You *suppose* immersion to have been practised by the Apostles, and you argue that *this* command *alone* must be literally obeyed; *i. e.* that it must be carried out strictly as you *conjecture* it was first administered—and thus *conjecture, too*, in the very teeth of opposing probabilities and overwhelming testimony; in the very face and eyes of all Gospel simplicity and consistency of statement! You recklessly argue, and pretend to believe, that it was the design of Christ to so embody the form in the ordinance, that a departure from it in the least respect, or as we might say a violation of the smallest letter, would as much nullify the whole ordinance, as a violation of its spirit!"

"What is that?" asked Brother Burton.

"Why you believe the *form* of dipping to be essential to the ordinance of baptism?" said Halley.

"Yes, certainly," responded Brother Burton.

"You also believe that there is some preparation of heart previous to the form of dipping essential to the ordinance?"

"Why, yes; one must repent and have faith on the Lord Jesus Christ."

"Very well, that is just as I stated it: the outward form is the letter, and the inward operation is the Spirit—now for an example. Two men take upon themselves the ordinance of baptism. One has for a motive and end to make *gain* of his church connection; the other a repentant, humble man, de-

signing, by the assisting grace of God, to live as a traveler and stranger here—as one who, whilst serving his master faithfully, is seeking a better country. Side by side they approach the stream. The first party, whom we will call Simon Magus, is led by an attending minister of the Gospel into the stream and wholly immersed in its waters: the other, whom we will call Penitent, kneels upon the bank and some of the pure water of the stream is poured or sprinkled upon him, and over both is breathed in solemn awe the name of the Triune God. Now do you suppose that God's recording angel would register Simon Magus as properly baptized, and therefore accepted; whilst trembling Penitent's baptism would be written down an entire failure, and he consequently rejected?"

"O, please do'nt," interrupted Anna; "please do'nt suppose such a case *possible*! Is not God a searcher of hearts? Then of what importance to him is such hypocrisy—such trickery and show?"

"But," said Halley, "if the *form* is an essential part of the ordinance, then God has so arranged matters that Simon Magus can be baptized as well as anybody else; and so far as God's requirement is *met* in him, so far He is bound to be pleased with him. Now I have met you, Brother Burton, with an 'extension of your own reasoning; and I will leave it for any rational and intelligent being, who has a knowledge of God as revealed in His word, to decide which of the two God would accept—keeping in mind of course that immersion is the letter of the ordinance, would he accept the hypocrite under the water or the kneeling, humble penitent upon the bank? Would he accept the *letter* or the *spirit*? The burden of our Savior's teachings was that the *letter* killeth, but the *spirit* alone maketh alive.

"Now let us look at this subject in another light. Is it reasonable to suppose that a religion, which was intended for all nations of the earth, would have in it, and *necessary* to the

administering of one of its ordinances, a command which it was impossible to obey at any place and at any time? But immersion cannot be practised in the cold northern regions of the earth *at all* for a large fraction of the year, and at no time with impunity; yet there are human beings there with souls as precious as yours or mine—and they must perish, or avail themselves of this religion and its benefits. When God instituted this ordinance his all-seeing eye was upon every human being, every living soul, that then thronged the teeming earth, or that has since existed upon it, or that now exists, or that will exist down to the end of time; and to suppose, for an instant, that He instituted an ordinance commanding them, or any portion of them, to do what it was impossible for them to do, is, to say the least, wholly absurd!

“The Lord’s supper was characterized by the utmost simplicity. At the close of the Paschal feast, Christ took a portion of the bread and wine which was left, and said, Eat and drink this in remembrance of me. There was no elaborate preparation—no show attached to it. The design was *spiritual*, and the form was *nothing*. All that was attached to it was spiritual. Unleavened bread was used, but no one supposes that Christ intended that that peculiar kind of bread must always be used or the ordinance become a nullity. They were also served in a peculiar manner at a table—but Christians do not think it necessary to imitate that peculiar manner, although Christ said ‘This do in remembrance of me.’ They understand, and rightly too, that the design of this ordinance is *spiritual*, all its benefits spiritual, and its form—nothing! This simplicity and spirituality are the essence of the whole New Testament, and therefore it must be found in the ordinance of baptism.

“This ordinance too, like its mate, must be so simple that it can be administered anywhere and under all circumstances—on the bleak and frozen shores of Iceland and Greenland, and along the ice-bound coast of the Antarctic Continent, as well as

in milder and tropical regions; in the broad and fertile valleys, in the parched desert and on the barren and arid plain. But this is not true of immersion: there is, in many thickly inhabited regions of the earth, a natural barrier rendering this mode of the ordinance of baptism an impossibility. The question is, then, simply this—has God made the ordinance of baptism an *exception*—*one lone exception*—to all the other commands, to the other of the two ordinances, and to the whole spirit and teachings of the New Testament, and of his word? And if he *has*, it is for you to show where and how! The *onus probandi* is thrown upon your shoulders! Where are the evidences? Point to the ‘Thus saith the Lord?’ How is this ordinance materially different in its design and effects from the other ordinance of the Church—the Lord’s Supper?

“But it has been proved that baptism is symbolic, that its use is merely as a symbol, and that it has a significance not found in the Greek use of the word; that its import is purely Christian. If you deny this, you affirm it to be merely a *plunge-bath*, of no use except to wash away the filth of the flesh: it could no longer be an ordinance of the Church of Christ. It is either a *plunge-bath* or a *symbol*; and in case it is a symbol, the *quantity* of water, whether it be much or little, can make no possible difference whatever. If there is any force in the reasoning that βαπτίζω *must* mean to immerse or cover the body with water, then I add that the Lord’s supper—κυριακὸν δεῖπνον (*kuriakon deipnon*), see 1 Cor. xi. 20—*must* mean, from the same reasoning, ‘a full meal, a feast, a banquet.’ It is just as necessary a deduction that if we have not eaten a *full meal* (δεῖπνον) at the Lord’s table, we have not eaten the Lord’s supper, as, that our bodies *must* be wholly immersed in water, to be baptized—one has just as much force and weight as the other. But the *quantity* at the Lord’s table, our Baptist friends admit with us, is not essential to the ordinance. Although the meaning of the word used demands a *full meal*, yet, strange as it may appear,

they have overlooked the *literal* meaning of the word, and believe, with us, that they have eaten the Lord's Supper when they have taken and used only the smallest portion of each element! And to be consistent, and by an extension of the same reasoning to the other ordinance, we infer that we have been baptized just as fully and acceptably when we have had only a small quantity of water applied to us, as though we had been dipped or immersed in a whole river or pond. Ay, more acceptably! For the Apostle Paul charged the Corinthian Church with *abusing* the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, *because* they made use of more food than the design of the ordinance required; and may not the same charge be brought against our Baptist friends in respect to the ordinance of baptism? You say that βαπτίζω *must* mean to be covered with water, because the Greeks used it in this sense; we reply, then, that δεῖπνον (*deipnon*) *must* mean to eat a full meal, because the Greeks used it in this sense. A *full meal* was the common everyday meaning of δεῖπνον, as much as *to dip* was the common every-day meaning of βαπτίζω. It would be just as sensible to make a *feast* of one as a *bath* of the other. But Paul rebukes our seeking after heathen significations of terms, and teaches us that the Christian use of them is altogether different. 'What,' says he, 'have ye not houses to eat and drink in?' And he might have added, as I think he would, if he had lived in this age of the world and witnessed the exhibition and teachings of our Baptist friends and also the accommodations for bathing in general use, 'What, and have ye not bath-rooms at home, and must you come together to abuse this ordinance also?' He says again, 'If any man hunger let him eat at home, that ye come not together unto condemnation.'

"I have been looking out for a sect to start up with the literal interpretation, such as our Baptist friends use in the single instance of baptism, carried out through the whole system of their faith; or at least one that should *literalize both* the ordi-

nances of the church; and just consider for a moment what the consequences would be. They would not only reason that because the purely Greek sense of βαπτίζω is *to dip, to plunge, to immerse*, etc., that consequently a person must be dipped to be baptized; but also that because the purely Greek sense of δεῖπνον is *a full meal, a feast, a banquet*, etc., that therefore a person must eat and drink *to satiety*, or he has not eaten the Lord's Supper; and that all churches not living up to the *full letter* of these ordinances are not gospel churches!

“Without doubt our *Baptist friends* would have added the last to that of baptism—for they sadly need it, as well as others, to make out and establish the consistency of their course and teachings—if the Corinthian Church had not fallen into the same error in time for Paul to set the matter right. What consequences would flow from the favoring and endorsing of such errors, we may gather from the sorrowful experiences of this church. Paul says, ‘Some were hungry, and others were *drunken!*’ Behold a band of revellers heated with wine commemorating the death and sufferings of their Lord! Behold a church of drunkards! Behold the long-drawn-out catalogue of horrors which follow in such a train! What true Christian would not turn with soul-sick loathing from the scene! Yet this is the natural result of your own reasoning, extended to both the ordinances of the church, Brother Burton; and if fully carried out, it must inevitably lead to it. There is no possible reason for one being *literal*, and the other *not literal!* No reason as found in the nature of the case, or the ordinance; and nothing but a direct and positive command from Jehovah himself—from Him who instituted these ordinances—that this one ordinance should be considered thus and so, as you consider it, could possibly, or should, convince an enlightened and inquiring mind which thinks more of the truth and word of God, than of the creeds of men!

“But now let us for a moment contemplate again the idea

and the result of Christ's attaching a particular form to an ordinance, so as to make that *form* an essential part of it. Let me ask you, Brother Burton, if a person could not come to the Lord's table, observing all the proprieties of the time and place *perfectly* as to outward form, and yet eat and drink damnation to his own soul?"

"Why, yes, I suppose so; one must discern the Lord's body, says Paul, or else he eats and drinks unworthily," responded Brother Burton languidly.

"And that is an operation of the mind," continued Halley. "Paul says, 'Examine yourselves;' that too is a mental operation entirely distinct from the form of the ordinance, so that whether we in reality commemorate the Lord's death, depends not on obedience to the *letter* of the ordinance, for we might obey the letter perfectly, and still heap guilt upon our souls; but what is required is an obedience to the *spirit* of the ordinance—a discerning of the Lord's body. Now let me ask you if a person might not take upon himself the ordinance of baptism, after the most approved Baptist manner, and still be at heart a deceiver or self-deceived? Take it upon himself from precisely the same motive that a man, who wears religion as a cloak, would approach the communion-table with sanctimonious gravity and outward punctiliousness; and would not the sacrilege be the same in nature, and equally abhorrent in the eyes of God?"

"Certainly, certainly, there is reason to believe that many a person enters into a church by baptism, and regularly communes with us, who is at heart a Simon Magus, 'most truly in the gall of bitterness, and the bonds of iniquity.'"

"Then it follows as a necessary sequence that the *form* is no more necessary to one ordinance than to the other; both may be observed perfectly in the letter, and instead of being recognized and accepted of God, will but sharpen his anger against the sacrilegious, daring intruder into the presence of a

God who is a Spirit, and who seeketh such to worship him, as worship him in spirit and in truth. The two ordinances in design are perfectly parallel."

"But a certain form *is* necessary in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper," said Brother Burton: "bread must be broken and wine must be poured out, and we must appropriate some of each element, or otherwise we do not commemorate our Lord's death and sufferings, and the ordinance is not administered."

"Exactly," replied Halley; "bread must be broken and wine must be poured out, but the *quality* or *quantity* of the bread and wine, or the manner of breaking and pouring out, or the manner of appropriating them to ourselves after being broken and poured out, are all considerations *not* essential to the ordinance. So also in baptism, certain things are essential: water must be used and applied to us in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or else we are not baptized; but, as in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, the *quality* or *quantity* of the water used, or the manner of applying it, are not essential to the ordinance.

"Now *I* will take a position, and you may direct your batteries against it as much as you please, it will only reveal more clearly its foundation on God's immutable truth; and thus founded, the combined artillery of earth cannot shake it. The position is, that the *essence* of all God's commands is *spiritual*, and necessarily implies a *spiritual obedience*, without any regard to the letter or outward act, only so far as comprehended in, and necessary, to the spirit: and that the design of all God's ordinances is a *spiritual effect*: if they fail of this, they become to us a dead letter, or worse still, a condemnation to our souls. Material things are used or comprehended *only* as a necessary vehicle of action, or to make a deeper impression upon our minds. If I were in search of a church of Christ, I would not so much look after *forms* and *genealogies*, as after the spirit

of the Gospel as exhibited in the characters and lives of its members. If our Savior had considered forms of much value, he could not have found at his coming wherewith to blame the Jewish church, for they were exceedingly punctilious as to forms, although spiritually dead; and of this he reproveth them even unto bitterness. 'Wo! unto you, Scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear outwardly beautiful, but within are full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness. Even so ye also appear outwardly righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.' This is the tendency of all undue attachment to forms; and there is by no means so much excuse for this attachment under the Gospel dispensation as under the old. The Old Testament worship was necessarily of many precise forms, so as to preserve a distinct nation in the midst of paganism and idolatry; but it was not intended that the Jews should attach much importance to this *precision*, for 'To obey is better than sacrifice' (1 Sam. xv. 22). 'O Lord, thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it, thou delightest not in burnt-offerings. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit, a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise' (Ps. li. 16-17.) 'To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord; I am full of the burnt-offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he-goats. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand, to tread my courts? Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and Sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth; they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them. And when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you; yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear; your hands are full of blood. Wash you, make you clean; put away

the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow' (Isa. i. 11-17).

"To rebuke this tendency to formalism, was the burden of all the prophets, and the burden of the teachings of Christ. The Scribe said unto Jesus, 'Well Master thou hast said the truth, for there is one God; and to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbor as himself, is more than all burnt-offerings and sacrifices. And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God' (Mark xii. 32-34). 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing' (John vi. 63). Thus we might heap up text upon text almost beyond computation, but let this suffice.

After the apostolic age the church began to relapse again, and to give undue heed to forms and ceremonies, and to adopt wrong principles of interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures; as for instance, the *allegorical* and *traditional*. And the causes that brought about a change in the mode of baptism, were probably not only the early tendency of the church to formalism, and to adhere strictly to the *letter*, but also oriental usages and the habits of warmer regions; a false interpretation of Romans vi. 3-5, and Col. ii. 12; and a very early habit of ascribing *peculiar virtue* to *external forms*. The habits of oriental nations inhabiting a warm climate are a sufficient cause to introduce the change of the mode of baptism from sprinkling or pouring to immersion, on favorable occasions; and the others are fully sufficient at such a time to extend, perpetuate, and confirm it. 'This attachment to forms,' says a learned divine, 'throng every page of the early history of the church, of which the rite of baptism alone would furnish volumes of proof. Let the holy water—the baptismal chrism to symbolize and *bestow* the Holy Spirit—the putting on of white robes after

baptism to symbolize the putting on of Christ—the baptism of men and women perfectly naked to denote their entire moral nakedness before putting on Christ—the anointing the eyes and ears to denote the sanctification of the senses—the eating of honey and milk—the sign of the cross—and finally, let *baptismal regeneration*, the sum and completion of all these formal tendencies, bear witness to the mournful truth.’ Thus the world in a few centuries was benighted, and all truth obscured in the Dark Ages—the midnight of Papal gloom—and as God made no new revelations to man, in this chaotic mass of good and evil, truth must be sought after. And it has been through the investigations and researches of many minds, that the outlines of the great system of *universal truth* have been grasped, but to a greater or less degree mingled with error. Hence, viewing the system of truth in different lights, all could not unite to any great extent in one body, and thereby different sects arose. But when all truth is seen, which may be seen, even on these much-controverted subjects, then all true Christians will so far agree, that no obstacle will remain to their perfect union in feeling and action.”

“May God speed that happy time! that glorious day!” exclaimed Anna, forgetting everything else in the enthusiasm of the moment.

“I have shown, I think, conclusively,” said Halley, in continuation, “that even if immersion, and immersion *only*, was practised by John and the Apostles, that there would be no reason why *we* should adopt that particular mode—that the doctrine of immersion would be wholly inconsistent by living up to the *letter* in this single instance, whereas in *all* others we only give heed to the *spirit*—that there is no reason why we should obey the letter in this command, and refuse to obey the letter in all other commands, or *vice versâ*, that there is no reason in our simply giving heed to the *spirit* of other commands, and giving heed to the *letter* only in this *one* instance;

and that the carrying out the principles on which literal interpretation is based, would make our religion more ceremonial than the Jewish, and more lifeless and spiritless than that of the Romanist.

“Paul says, ‘God has made us able ministers of the New Testament, not of the letter, but of the spirit, for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life’ (see 2 Cor. iii. 6). But the truth is, βαπτίζω was used only to denote the ordinance of baptism, with no reference whatever to the mode. Baptism is symbolic — an emblem of the purifying influences of the Holy Spirit — and the grand and leading symbol of purification instituted by Jehovah himself is *sprinkling*. Immersion is nowhere foretold by the prophets, but sprinkling is, and that too as connected with the new dispensation. And the rational and proper rendering of the Greek text in view of this gives us no intimation whatever that immersion was practised by the Apostles and the apostolic church. The practice of immersion was introduced and persisted in, only from an undue and superstitious regard to *forms* and *ceremonies*; and those too, that would outrage every law of decency, and should put to shame all civilized and Christian society; therefore these have been relinquished in more modern times, but immersion retained. Sprinkling is more simple, more in accordance with the whole spirit of the New Testament, more Christlike; and an ordinance that can be used in all places, under all circumstances, and, like the Bible, is adapted to all phases of society, conditions of life, and nations of the earth. Is not the testimony then all-convincing, all-powerful and overwhelming in favor of sprinkling? Is it not wholly satisfactory? Ay, more! Whilst I admit that baptism *may be* administered by other forms, as the word used limits to no form in its Christian use; yet I claim that sprinkling is the Bible mode, and has all the preferences of being a form instituted by Jehovah himself; and in all probability as we have seen, adopted by John the Baptist, submitted to by

our blessed Savior, and practised by the Apostles and the primitive church."

Halley paused. His sentences had rolled out as irresistibly as a tide of glowing lava from a crater's mouth livid with coruscations. Every one of his listeners sat as though chained to his seat—chained by that irresistible something, that is known by as many names as there are phases of society and conditions of life, in which controlling minds can exercise power.

"I am thinking," said Anna, "what possible excuse there is left for any one denomination to claim to be the *only true church*, the *only gospel church*, etc., because they differ in some of their *forms* from their brethren, whereas they all unite in the *Spirit*. How must God regard such a pretence among the members of his household! Would it be called uncharitable, or by a worse name?"

"The Greek church," said Halley, "claims the most direct and uninterrupted descent from the apostolic church, and hugging her idols to her bosom, she looks askance at her neighbors as apostates and heretics! Her sister of Rome bows the knee to a visible head, obeying his mandates as the mandates of God; and claiming with her infallibility to be the *only true church*, she hurls her anathemas at all other pretenders! Farther east hangs the now declining star of Mahomet, 'There is no God but God, and Mahomet is his prophet.' Being an elder brother, in power, of Jesus Christ, though appearing among men more recently, and being only inferior to God himself, those, and those only who follow his teachings, can enter the paradise of the blessed. *There is no church but the church of Mahomet!*

"On the western boundaries of our own country, there has recently appeared a rival star, leading a rival church, with rival claims to the one churchism! And I regret to add that in the very bosom of Protestantism there is another sect ambitious

to contest the field of exclusiveness; cherishing in her bosom, feelings kindred to those above named; and claiming that *there is no church but the Baptist church! Lo! we are the true body of Christ, and all others are deceivers!*"

CHAPTER VII.

"Many a *green isle* needs must be
In the deep wide sea of misery,
Or the mariner, worn and wan,
Never thus could voyage on
Day and night, and night and day,
Drifting on his dreary way,
With the solid darkness black
Closing round his vessel's track."

"ANNA CLAYTON!" A side door opened and the mother looking sharply around, called again, "Anna Clayton!" Anna, who was out upon the porch leaning her forehead thoughtfully against the lattice-work with her eyes fixed upon the swaying grain over which a light wind left a track of shadows, was thinking anxious thoughts; but her mind was not where her eyes had been long resting; no, the fartherest possible from the peaceful scene around her. The quiet fields and whispering summer air had nothing in common with the restless surging of her thoughts over the trackless deep of the unknown future around which even now shadows seemed gathering. She started at the call, like one awakening from a dream, and following the direction of the voice, entered a private apartment where her Mother Clayton awaited her.

“Anna, I want to warn you about this young Halley,” said the mother, sharply. “In my opinion he’s a suspicious character! I wish you wouldn’t place so much dependence on what he says, for I do’n’t believe a word of it! Only just think, how he contradicts Brother Burton, and Brother Longwind, and even your father too, Anna! I shouldn’t suppose you could countenance him at all, the impudent fellow!”

“But, mother,” said Anna, with a tremulous voice, “there is of necessity a contradiction, or no argument; and does he not prove his positions?”

“Prove his positions? I do’n’t believe a word he says! And I do’n’t want to hear a word like that from your lips either, and what’s more, I won’t hear it, so let that settle the matter!” Mother Clayton was angrily leaving the room, when, recollecting herself, she said, “O, I thought I would tell you that Maria Sherwood, Peter Sims, and Mary Stocher, are going to tell their experience at the covenant meeting Saturday, and be baptized Sunday; so, if you want company, then is your time to go on.”

“But, mother —” said Anna.

“I do’n’t want to hear a word of excuse: if you ever intend to be baptized, then is the best time you’ll have. Brother Burton is the best hand at it, and does it the prettiest of anybody ever I see. Shall I tell your father that you’ll be ready?”

“O mother, do not urge me! I cannot — I cannot *now!*”

“*Cannot now!* O yes, it is wait, wait! we’ve already waited over one covenant meeting — I do’n’t believe you ever mean to do it; I’ve no confidence in such religion at all! Now I give you timely warning, if you *do’n’t* do it, you need’n’t expect many more favors from me, or your father either!”

“Do’n’t what, mother?” asked Anna, almost wholly bewildered by the violence of the vituperation.

“Why, if you do’n’t join the Church, and live like a consistent Christian, we can’t countenance you, that’s all! Now you’ve had your warning, and you can choose your own path!”

Thus saying she slammed the door after her, as was her wont when giving notice to all in the house of the ruffled state of her temper, and left the terrified and sobbing Anna alone. Alone! ay, if the earth at that moment had opened her mouth and swallowed her up in her gloomy caverns, she could not have felt more helplessly, or more hopelessly alone.

“O, my Father and my God, what shall I do?” she exclaimed, raising her eyes suffused with tears, and her clasped hands toward heaven. “You have had your warning now, choose your own path,” echoed and re-echoed again and again through her throbbing brain. “Choose — choose!” O, if I dared to come before God with a lie in my mouth, she thought, professing to believe what I do not believe, then I might choose, but I cannot — I dare not! “Whether ye ought to serve God rather than man, judge ye,” whispered, already come in answer to her earnest call and prayer to God, a sweet Spirit voice. “Choose ye this day whom ye will serve: if God, then serve him, and fear not: if parents, then serve them—choose—but O, choose wisely!” The Spirit ceased its promptings, and fixed its earnest gaze upon her deeply troubled soul, waiting a response, that it might carry back to the Eternal Throne the joyful news that there was another mortal who could leave all for God.

Anna sunk upon her knees, and burying her face in her hands, exclaimed, “O blessed Jesus, thou hast died for me — hast endured shame, reproach, pain, and even death for me, and shall I refuse to endure this light affliction for thy name’s glory? No, welcome shame, welcome reproach, welcome poverty, if I meet them in the path of duty, obeying thee! O guide me by thy Spirit into truth, and help me to follow its dictates wherever it may lead me. *Here am I.* O God, sustain me in this hour! Jesus, help me to follow the promptings of thy Spirit through life and even unto death, and thy name be blessed evermore.”

The struggle was ended, and a calm, almost like a joy, fell upon her soul. “I will be true to my own convictions of duty,

come what may!" she exclaimed, rising from her knees and throwing wide the window that opened on the porch; stepping out, she was soon lost among the overhanging trees along the brook-side that shaded the path to the widow's cottage.

On a rude bench in the garden within the grateful shade of two huge oaks—giants of past centuries—sat our clerical friends.

"I could tell you very quick what I should do in this case," said Brother Burton, speaking more freely now than he did in the late controversy. "There is no reason in letting things go their own way—not the least. You say the girl has considerable influence over her young associates, and there's no telling where the mischief may end, possibly in the tearing up of the Church—at all events you've got now a clear field, and I'd keep it. I would let her know that my will was *law*, and she must obey or suffer the consequences."

"I know I have a clear field now, but it an't to be expected that I can keep it," said Elder Clayton, thoughtfully. "Moses Wise has recently moved into town—he is a Presbyterian, and has a son who is a minister. He is at home now on a visit, and has given out an appointment at the Academy rooms for four o'clock next Sabbath afternoon. So you see they are creeping in around us, and we shall be obliged to make room for them whether we will or no."

"But the disgrace of having a member of your own family adopt such a creed," urged Brother Burton. "It certainly will have a most disastrous effect upon the Baptist cause."

"I do'n't know—really I do'n't know," responded the Elder, measuredly and musingly. "Halley certainly made it look rather reasonable—the sprinkling, I mean—really I do'n't know what to think about the matter myself—I never could see these things clearly in my own mind."

"I wonder," returned Brother Burton, with a sarcastic curl of the lip, "if you an't about turning sprinkler too! you had

better renounce your faith publicly next Sabbath, and go to the Rev. Mr. Wise to be sprinkled!"

"O, no, no, no, I have'nt any such idea as that, but the fellowship I was thinking about—they like their way, and why have'nt they as good a right to it as we to ours? There is room enough in the world for us all to work in; then why not give them a God speed instead of a nudge? That's what I was thinking about."

"An't it of any consequence," asked Brother Burton, starting to his feet, and pacing up and down the gravel-walk underneath the trees. "An't it of any consequence that truth should triumph over error? Should we keep silence and see an institution (I can't call it a church) gaining ground even on our own territory, that has in it, and as one of its distinguishing features, such an act of high-handed rebellion against God, as the sprinkling — I will not call it baptism — of little infants? They can neither repent nor exercise faith, and consequently have no right to the ordinance! It is impious! It is a high-handed act of sacrilege!"

"Yes," said Father Longwind, "that is the leprous spot. If they would confine their sprinkling to adults, on confession of their faith, we would'nt so much mind it; but this giving it to babies — bah! If baptism converted these little thoughtless, senseless things, then there might be some sense in it. But the baptized children of these sprinklers grow up sinners just as though they had never been baptized."

"The long and short of it is this," said Brother Burton; "it is a relic of Popery! There's not a single command in the Bible for it — not one! And, Brother Clayton, if you go on encouraging these things, or even let them grow up around you without making an effort to pull them down, you may expect before long to see a 'little infant mewling and puking in its mother's arms' brought up before the altar of your own church, and the Rev. Mr. Wise, or some other Rev. Mr., sprinkle it there

before the eyes of your own congregation! Would'nt that be a beautiful sight in a Baptist community, and in a Baptist church! Before I would witness such a sacrilege, I would flee forty miles into a wilderness!"

This had the desired effect on the easy, kind-hearted man, who halted between affection for his adopted child and his own inherent sense of the natural rights of others on one side, and the deeply-rooted prejudices of education instilled into his very nature through a long succession of years on the other. Respect for his more energetic brother's opinion thrown in turned the balance, and it was decided that an effort should be made to pull down this new sect likely to spring up in the neighborhood, and as the first step to be taken, Anna was to be brought upon the rack.

"I had rather you would talk with her, Brother Burton," said Elder Clayton, his nature still recoiling from the, to him, unnatural deed. "Try to persuade her," he added with a slight tremor in his voice, "it is hard, it is a severe alternative to turn the child away, for I promised her mother, as she breathed her last breath, that she should be as near to me as my own child. But, as you say, I can't see any other way to put down this rebellion than to begin at home."

"Were she your own child, you would be justified in doing it," replied Brother Burton. "But you need'nt fear it will ever come to that. Young folks now-a-days think too much of their bread and butter to risk it so rashly. You may depend upon it — that this is the surest and best possible way to bring matters around satisfactorily. You may expect to see her go into the water next Sabbath with the rest of them. Just quote a little Scripture to her for effect, and then come right down as firmly as possible with your terms, and never flinch."

"I had rather you would do it," he replied, "and whatever you do I will abide by, only do'nt be too severe with the poor child — she has never known severity."

As Anna pursued the lonely shaded path to her friend's cottage, she determined to tell her all her trials, and ask her advice as to the course proper for her to take in this matter; but when she met the widow's wan face, so livid with patient woe, and saw her bend with such sweet resignation over the still sinking child, which now claimed her almost unremitting care, and had become so emaciated, deformed, and loathsome with putrid swellings; or as she marked the melancholy gaze that fixed itself upon the distant churchyard where the white tombstones were peering out from the climbing vines and overhanging shrubbery and trees in solemn waiting for the next comer, with a look that said:

“The dead are engulf'd beneath them,
Sunk in the grassy waves; •
But we have more dead in our hearts to-day,
Than the Earth in all her graves.”

When Anna thus beheld the deep grief and anxious care of the widow, she feared that it might add to the burden already pressing out her life, and so locked her own troubles in her bosom. Indeed, for the time she almost forgot them—she thought little of self whilst soothing and encouraging her friend, and relieving her of the care of the sick child. Singing was his favorite diversion, and he always claimed of Anna a song or a story. “Sing to Charlie of that Happy Land, far, far away,” he said. And again the familiar strains of that thrilling little song, wafted by Anna's sweet voice, soothed a suffering mortal with the hope of coming glory; and the story of Jesus when he took little children in his arms and blessed them, was never more feelingly told, or more attentively listened to. So the hour wore away.

“You must try and bear up cheerfully,” said Anna, when about parting with them. “I will repeat to you, the lesson you have often taught to me; God is good, and ‘He doeth all things well.’”

“Yes, God is good,” repeated widow Giles; “God is good, even when he presses a cup of sorrow to the lips of his children; he mixes with it such drops of sweetness, that they need never repine. Their sorrows wean them from earth, and the sweetness draws them toward heaven. Yes, ’tis true ‘He doeth all things well.’ Through six sorrows hath he upheld me, and from the seventh will he deliver me, blessed be the name of the Lord.”

Anna looked into the widow’s face which for the moment lit up, like as a dense grey cloud when dashed with the golden hues of evening, and she thought that truly “by the sorrow of the countenance, the heart is made better;” and if it is God’s will that I should drain the dregs from that bitter cup, may I improve upon them as wisely as this poor woman. She had endeavored to appear cheerful, even light-hearted and hopeful, but by those unknown avenues of communication of mind with mind, her friend had discovered that all was not well.

“Anna,” she said, laying her hand upon her shoulder to detain her as she turned to go, “Anna, there has trouble fallen on you. I would to God, Anna, that I could shield you from it; but be that as it may, remember that all I can do for you will be done most willingly.”

Anna turned, and looked inquiringly with an earnest gaze into the face of the widow, and the words even trembled on her tongue, but still she restrained them, and pressed them down again into her own heart.

“I wish your pathway, Anna, might be one of flowers,” she continued; “but He who knoweth better than we, hath determined that

‘The path of sorrow, and that path alone
Leads to the land where sorrow is unknown.’”

Anna pressed her lips to those of her friend, and was gone. Although she had become strengthened and comforted, yet thought had quickened, and she turned down the road as it

was a longer way home, and she felt that she needed time for self-communing ere she again faced her destiny.

“Why, Anna, I’m so glad you’ve come this way, I’ve just been over to see you. Let’s sit down under this tree, for I want to talk with you.” The speaker was Mary Stocher, one of Anna’s most intimate friends among her young associates. “I want to know what dress you are going to wear Sunday,” she continued; “and won’t there have to be another robe made? there are only two now.” Mary paused, and noticing the troubled and perplexed look in Anna’s face, added by way of explanation, “Your mother told me that you were going on with us next Sabbath?”

Still Anna hesitated, and cast her eyes on the ground.

“Why what makes you look so, Anna? What have I said to hurt your feelings?”

“Mary, did mother tell you that I would be baptized next Sabbath?”

“Yes; she said, she expected you would. But what is the matter, Anna?”

“Nothing, Mary; only I’ve no such intentions, that’s all!”

“What! don’t you ever intend to join a church? Can it be true what I heard the other day?”

“What did you hear?”

“I do not like to tell you, Anna, for I did not believe a word of it. I went over to see you, to-day, to make sure it was false; but what am I to think now?”

“You are to think, Mary, just what I’ve told you, that I have no intention of being immersed next Sabbath — nothing more — nothing less.”

Mary’s eyes filled with tears, and she looked mournfully, almost reproachfully, at her friend.

“It is my turn now to ask for an explanation,” said Anna. “Is it to be considered a crime, if I should prefer to wait a season; or if I should even become honestly convinced that

some other way would better harmonize with my idea of the word of God? As I am to understand it for myself, must I not be governed by *my* understanding of it? Now tell me plainly, what it is you have heard, and perhaps you will find that you are laboring under a mistaken idea of my motives."

"I may as well tell you first as last, but don't think I ever believed it, for I never did. Aunt Katy told mother that you was becoming perfectly reckless, didn't seem to have any regard for sacred things at all, and that Halley ——"

"What of him?" interrupted Anna.

"That his influence was none of the best, and 'twas feared he might be your ruin."

"Who told aunt Katy?"

"I believe she claimed it came directly from your mother; but your mother told me to-day, it had come out all right; Elder Burton had been there and upset Halley's Catholic creed — hoed him out completely—and so she thought you would be ready to go on with us in baptism, and be an exemplary Christian."

Anna was morbidly sensitive regarding her character and the purity of her motives. To be regarded unprincipled and reckless, was to her the most serious of charges, and in the purity of her own soul she had never dreamed it possible that her motives could be thus construed.

"Catholic creed!" she repeated. "Mary, if to believe that the ordinance of baptism can be administered by sprinkling, is to be a Catholic—then Mr. Halley's creed is Catholic, and so is mine."

"Why, is that all? I supposed he had all sorts of outlandish notions. My mother was a Methodist when she joined this church, and she says, she don't believe immersion is the only form of baptism—but father does. O, Anna, you ought to read this book. I was reading it when you came along. I'm sure it is made out here, as plain as plain can be, that baptism

is nothing else but an immersion of the whole body in water. Father Longwind left it here, but you may take it home with you. Read it, do Anna, it would be such a comfort to us all, if you could go with us next Sabbath."

"I have read the book," Anna replied.

"Have read it? Why, Anna, is it possible you could read this book, and not be convinced? It seems to me that I should have been just like Theodosia on the 32d page here, 'When she went to her chamber and took her Testament, and read how they were baptized *in the river Jordan*. How Jesus after he was baptized came *up out of the water*. How they went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him; and when he came *up out of the water*, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip.' She compared these statements with what she had seen at the river, and did not need any testimony from the Lexicons to satisfy her that John's baptism and Philip's baptism was immersion. Why else did they go into the water? Why else was it done in the river? Now, Anna, you know that's the way it reads in the Bible, and what more testimony *does* it need?"

"Do you believe this, Mary?"

"Certainly — how can I believe otherwise?"

"I do not desire to have you. I would not shake your faith for all the world, if you are settled in it and satisfied."

"But, Anna, I have a great curiosity to know how you would get around such evidence as this? I can't see any possible way; but I know you could always see right through a problem, when we went to school together, that was a perfect puzzle to me."

"Well then, I will answer your question. What you deem so satisfactory is, because it reads *in Jordan, into and up out of the water*. Now you know that the New Testament was not originally written in the English language?"

"Why, no, it was written in Greek; this book tells all about it."

“And, Mary, the words here translated *in* and *into*, are in Greek $\epsilon\nu$ and $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$?”

“Yes,” answered Mary.

“Now suppose you should take up Walker’s Dictionary, and turn to the word ‘cry.’ You will find it to mean *lamenting, shriek, scream, weeping, mourning, clamor, outcry, exclamation of triumph or wonder, proclamation, acclamation, popular favor, voice, utterance, names of vocal expression, importunate call, yelping of dogs, yell, inarticulate noise*, etc. Now how would you go to work to prove that the word ‘cry’ *invariably* means *weeping* or *mourning*, and insist upon giving it that significance wherever you meet with it?”

“Why, I would not be so silly as to try, that’s all!”

“Very well, then, you take up a Greek Lexicon, and you will find that those two Greek words have as great a variety of significations, as Walker gives to the word *cry*; and even more, for a German scholar has traced out twenty-six different meanings for the word $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$; then what confidence should you place in the assertion that they *must* mean *in* and *into*?”

“Why really I don’t know; but this book don’t talk like that. Here it says on page 88, that ‘ $\epsilon\nu$ means *in* in Greek, as much as *in* does in English; $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ means *into* in Greek, as much as *into* does in English.’ I supposed by that they meant *in* and *into*, and nothing else, though he afterwards says, ‘that sometimes, very rarely $\epsilon\nu$ means *with* in the sense of an instrument;’ and then he says, ‘that it is only in the ratio of twenty-seven hundred to forty that it has any other meaning than *in*.’ I thought that was not a chance worth speaking about.”

“Mary, if you could read Greek as George can, you could soon satisfy yourself that this is a barefaced assertion, without the shadow of truth in it! *In* is only one of the many meanings of the Greek word $\epsilon\nu$. Now to satisfy myself on this and other matters, I prevailed on George to write off for me the meaning of these two words, and also others; and some passages in

Greek, too, that I might consult them at my leisure, and become acquainted with them; and I will give you some idea of their meaning and significance, for I have them in my pocket (taking a little neatly-kept blank-book from her pocket), I always carry them, and like to study them: here they are. According to Donnegan and Pickering, and in fact, all Greek Lexicographers, ἐν means *at, in, on, within, with, among, before, by, near, nigh to, during, by means of, while, therein, thereat, thereby, with respect to*, etc. etc. And *into*, as I just stated, is only one of the twenty-six different significations which belong to εἰς! Then how is it to be proved that they *should* be, and *must* be in these cases rendered *in* and *into*? Certainly not by the import of the words themselves. They must find other testimony than the words in question to prove it."

"But it says on page 90," continued Mary, turning over the leaves, "that King James forbade the translators rendering it *in*, and for that reason they made it read, 'I baptize you *with* water, etc.'"

"This certainly is a new fact for historians to chronicle, if it be true," said Anna; "but most probably it originated in the author's wonderfully fertile brain. But you might ask the gentleman, if he was here, to turn to Luke iii. 16, and Acts i. 5, and xi. 16, and then see if he could discover no better reason for its being rendered thus, than the prohibition of King James?"

"Why, what reason is there in those passages for it?" asked Mary, with intense interest.

"The noun *water*," replied Anna, consulting her pocket-manual, "ὑδὼρ (*hudōr*), is used in these places in the dative form ὑδάτι (*hudati*), without any preposition at all, and is thus used *only* as a *means or instrument*, classical scholars inform us, and *never* as a place in which anything is said to be, or to be done. Hence in these passages it must be rendered *with* water, *i. e.*, water considered as an instrument. And in the other

places where the preposition *ἐν* is used before the noun *ὕδωρ* (*ἐν ὕδατι*), it may, according to his own admission on page 89, 'mean *with* in the sense of an instrument.' Now, Mary, can you see no reason why the translators rendered it *with* water, *with* the Holy Ghost, etc.?"

"Certainly, if it *must* be rendered thus, that is a sufficient reason; but where did you say those passages were? Let me look them up and read them: I have a Bible here. Luke iii. 16, John answered, saying unto them all, 'I indeed baptize you *with* water; but one mightier than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire.' You say that there is no preposition used there before water?"

"No, there is none. It reads in the original, as I have it written here, 'Εγὼ μὲν ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς (*ego men hudati baptizo humas*), 'I indeed water baptize you;' this is the order of the words; water being used in the dative without a governing word *only* as an instrument; and therefore it must be rendered in English, 'I baptize you *with* water.' And the next passage," continued Anna, taking the Bible, "is in Acts i. 5, the words of our Savior: 'For John truly baptized (with) water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.' And the other, the words of Peter, is in Acts xi. 16, 'Then remembered I the words of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized (with) water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.'"

"That really has some force," said Mary, musingly.

"I would inquire also," continued Anna, "what propriety there would be in rendering passages, 'I baptize you *in* the Holy Ghost?' For in every instance it is in the original *ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ* (*en pneumati hagio*). Now, Mary, keeping this in mind, let us examine the Scriptures and see whether they were *dipped in* the Holy Ghost, or the Holy Ghost applied *to* them in the sense of an agent or means. But, Mary, there is

a better reason still, for regarding water to be used in baptism as an instrument or means only. If God's word did not furnish the evidences already found, still it would be most satisfactory to me to regard the baptismal water only as an instrument for administering the ordinance. Now can you tell me what the meaning of the ordinance of baptism is?"

"Meaning — meaning?" said Mary, hesitatingly, "why I read somewhere that it signifies the immersing of the whole man in the Spirit of a new life."

"That sounds very much like a Baptist definition," responded Anna; "but we will look at it in that form. 'It signifies' — then it is a symbol, and it signifies the immersion of the whole man in the spirit of a new life—or in other words, it is regeneration. Whose operation is that?"

"Why it is the work of the Spirit—the Holy Spirit—to regenerate the soul."

"You are sure then, Mary, that it could be accomplished in no other way, only by the agency of the Spirit?"

"Certainly; who ever heard or read of any other way?"

"Then there can be no doubt that it refers to the operation of the Holy Spirit upon the heart of the individual; or, in other words, the outward rite of baptism signifies the inward operation of the Spirit. Now what is this inward operation called? What did John call it?"

"Why, a baptism of the Holy Ghost."

"Then it follows that water baptism is a type—or as you expressed it—water baptism signifies Spirit baptism. This is the true definition of the term. Now in my hat here, Mary, you see a rose—is it a natural rose?"

"Why no, Anna, I should call it an imitation."

"What makes you think so, Mary?"

"Because it looks just like a natural rose."

"Then it is a type of a natural rose, and you know it to be such from the fact that it looks like one, *i. e.* it is like a rose in

form and color. Now the *reason* of its being a type, is because it looks like a natural rose — now keep that in mind, Mary. Now let me ask you how you suppose water baptism to be a type of the Spirit baptism?"

"How? — why I do'nt know — I never thought of that before."

"Could it be a type if it were not in some way like it? If this flower was in form and color a lily, would it be a type of a rose?"

"No, certainly not, Anna. Water baptism must in some way be like Spirit baptism."

"In what respect should you say, Mary?"

"Why in immersing the whole man in the spirit of a new life—I guess. That I'm sure would be good Baptist orthodoxy."

"But is it Bible orthodoxy? Does the Bible call the *effect produced* a baptism? Now let us turn and see whether it is the effect produced or the *act of receiving*, that the Bible calls a baptism. Acts i. 5, Jesus says they shall be baptized. Acts ii. 3, 'And there appeared cloven tongues like as of fire that sat upon each of them.' Here was a fulfilment of the promise, yet they were not immersed, neither does it speak of any effect produced upon their hearts."

"It might be the next verse," said Mary; "'And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance.' That sounds more Baptist fashion."

"Being filled with, is not being immersed in, or dipped in," said Anna. "But let us examine a little farther. What says Peter? Turn to Acts x. 44: 'While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word.' This corresponds, you see, with Acts ii. 3; he makes it the *act of receiving* the Holy Ghost, not the effect produced by him."

"But neither of them is directly called a baptism," said Mary.

“An’t they?” replied Anna. “Turn to the next chapter—to Acts xi. 15, 16, ‘And as I began to speak the Holy Ghost *fell* on them as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how he said, John truly baptized (with) water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.’ Peter do’nt tell us what new creatures they had become, nor what wonderful things they had performed, or were expected thereafter to perform, and then call that a baptism; but the spirit *fell* or descended upon them and they were baptized. What they might be led to do afterwards as a consequence of this act called baptism — was a result, a fruit of it.”

“I see it plainly now,” exclaimed Mary. “I wonder I never saw it before. It is the *act*, not the effect, most unquestionably.”

“Then if Spirit baptism is the act of receiving the Holy Spirit, water baptism (as every one admits) is the act of receiving the baptismal water. Now does it not necessarily follow that one act must be like the other act, or one cannot be said to be the type or shadow of the other?”

“Certainly, that is just as plain as that the rose in your hat is an imitation or type of a natural rose.”

“Then please tell me how the act of immersion is like the act of the Spirit falling upon men.”

“How? — why —” Mary stopped, astonished at her own inevitable and necessary inference.

“In one case,” continued Anna, “the person is dipped under the water, and in the other case the Spirit falls down upon the person — what a beautiful type is this truly!”

“Why, Anna, it’s no type at all — is it? If the Spirit is applied to the person — then to be a type, water should be applied to the person. If the Spirit descends or falls upon the person, water certainly should do the same.”

“Just so, Mary. Now you know why I said that there was a better reason still why water was to be considered an instrument in the ordinance of baptism, just as Luke, Peter, and our

blessed Savior said it was. And the statements of Matthew, Mark, and John fully harmonize with this view—and so do those of Paul.”

“Yes, that is perfectly plain now, Anna; and I shall never see any one dipped under the water again, but I shall think what a bad type it is. But there are other points I would like to have you examine. Here on page 39, regarding the meaning of the word *baptize*, it says, ‘It is the meaning of the word in the New Testament in the time of Christ, and among the people for whom the Gospels were first written—we want not the meaning it *has acquired* since its transfer to our language.’”

“And I would add,” replied Anna, “neither do we of necessity confine ourselves to the *primary* meaning of the word as used by *heathen* writers for centuries before the knowledge of Christianity was introduced among them. *It is the New Testament meaning in the time of Christ, we want*—that, and only that.”

“Well,” said Mary, “how is that to be got at? Do’nt you have to refer to Greek Lexicons where its meaning is given—and is it not always given there *to dip, to immerse?*”

“It is to be got at,” responded Anna, “just as hundreds of other cases in the New Testament Greek are disposed of. Where the classical signification does not bring out the force and meaning in full, then give it the meaning that the nature of the case demands—always guided of course and influenced by the current use of the word.

“For example,” continued Anna, consulting again her little memorandum-book, “Suppose the dispute was about the Greek word *δικαιοσύνη* (*dikosune*), which in classic Greek, as we learn from the Lexicons, means *justice, equity*, etc., but in the New Testament must mean *righteousness*, and that righteousness which God imputes to believers, because of their faith in Christ; also the righteousness of God. Now suppose this to be the word, and our Baptist friends argue as they do about the Greek word *βαπτίζω*, as you will find by referring to your book, page

130, where it is stated that, 'The New Testament was written not for the Jews, but for the Greeks to read, and consequently if the writers did not use Greek words in their ordinary Greek sense, they would not be understood; but would in fact convey an absolute falsehood.' According to this, then, *δικαιοσύνη* (*dikiosune*) should be called *justice* or *equity*, and nothing else, for this is the definition the Lexicons give it. But here we should be obliged to nudge our Baptist brother a little, and say, that sounds very well, my dear brother, but just turn to Matt. v. 6, 'Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after "*equity*," for they shall be filled.' Also the 10th verse of the same chapter, 'Blessed are they who are persecuted for *equity's* sake.' James ii. 23, 'Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for *equity*,' etc. etc. Now, my dear brother, what will you do with this word? Will you persist in retaining your *heathen* meaning, and thereby make the word of God of none effect, a jargon, a collection of inconsistencies? Or will you rather do, as we are obliged to do in every translation, warp the meaning of the words a little to suit the sentiment and the context? And besides, there are scores of words in the New Testament not found in classic Greek at all. Look in your Greek Lexicons, and they are not there! What will you do with these — call them zero invariably, or *selah*? Or will you throw them out entirely? To be consistent, my brother Baptist, you must cast them overboard, beyond the precincts of the New Testament, soul and body and all, for you know if the writers used words that could not be found in classic Greek — this heathen Greek you adhere to with such tenacity — why how in the name of all human things could they be understood at all!"

"Then it seems," said Mary, "that βαπτίζω is not the *only single exception* for which a change of meaning, or an extended one, is to be claimed — but only one word out of many."

"One of many," repeated Anna; "one of a host so great

that instead of being exceptions, they almost become the rule. We claim that the apostles labored to express a variety of *new* thoughts and ideas never before expressed in the Greek tongue, and consequently of *necessity* they extended the meaning of words and even coined new ones. When we come across one not found in classic Greek, we know of course that to be a new word—and this Baptists can't deny—so also when a word is used, of which the construction of the sentence and the nature of the truths taught, demand an extended meaning, as for example the one just referred to, *δικαιοσύνη* (*dikiosune*), then we feel ourselves authorized to give it.

“And we claim that *βαπτίζω* is one of this class, for Peter uses it in such a connection that it demands it. And so do all the apostles who use it, when we compare parallel passages and keep in mind its design. These are truths which are evident to every reader of the Greek Testament, and hence the burden of proof is thrown upon the Baptists. If they can prove that the New Testament writers did use all words, *without exception*, in the ordinary classic Greek sense, then this word *βαπτίζω* must go in with the rest, and the Bible become an unintelligible paradox. But if they fail to do this, we prefer so to interpret as to make all things consistent and harmonious.”

“I am astonished,” said Mary, “at the different phases you put on this unanswerable (?) argument, and at the ease with which you do it. Why you only breathe upon it and it's gone! But I'm sure that here on page 45, it makes the Rev. Albert Barnes, in his notes on the New Testament, admit everything—only just read it, Anna.”

“I recollect it perfectly well,” replied Anna, “but instead of admitting or granting *everything*, he in reality grants *nothing* that touches the point in question. It is so fixed up there and so construed as to convey that impression to those not familiar with his way of jumping conclusions and making assumptions. He also makes numerous quotations from Prof. Stuart and

others, but all this great parade of names is simply *to prove what everybody grants!* All classical scholars admit that the original — the primary meaning of βαπτίζω is *to dip*, and that it is kindred in meaning to the Hebrew word ‘*tabal*’ (טָבַל), just as they do that the classical meaning of δικαιοσύνη is *equity*, etc. But what weight has all this, when these same classical scholars assure us that in the Hellenistic Greek, the Greek of the New Testament, these words were used to convey a different meaning. How they were used by the *heathen* Greeks is not the question at issue. But the question is how did the Apostles, the early *Christian* Greeks use these words, and what is the evidence going to show that they were used in other than their primary sense? There is not even a shadow of proof — where there is no substance there can be no shadow, and so where there is no proof there can be no shadow of it — that they employed the word βαπτίζω in its strict classical sense: but on the other hand all the evidences go to prove that it was otherwise employed. Now turn to page 144, and see what reasoning your author uses to prove that this word must have its original signification. He says there, ‘This word was used hundreds of years before Luke wrote this book. Its meaning was as well fixed and defined as that of any word in the Greek language. Luke was writing to those who read and spoke (?) and understood this language (this word among the rest) in its ordinary sense, according to the familiar every-day usage of the people who employed it. We agree, and every scholar or critic of any note *has never denied* that the common, familiar (by this he means the classical) meaning of this word was to submerge, to dip. This we have proved (I think he made a great effort to prove what every one admits). But now we want to know in what sense Luke employs it (Exactly, that is what we all want). I answer that the presumption (!) is that he employs it just as every other writer does, for if he does not, nobody

will understand what he means (!). He must use words in the sense that other people use them, or other people will not know what he means; but as he wishes to be understood, and writes under the inspiration of infinite wisdom, he will use words thus.' (!)

“Weighty reasons these! And it’s all they have to urge! Not the shadow of proof! Not the shadow of an argument drawn from the harmony and consistency of the statements, and of things in the connection where it is used! He did not dare venture on that ground! But I would ask, can any one with even a pretence of being a Biblical and classical scholar, look another in the face and eye, and assert that Luke *employed words (all words) just as every other Greek writer did, and had done?* How can any one assert such barefaced falsehoods, with words too numerous to mention changed in their meaning from *specific* to *generic* terms—with hundreds having their significations almost entirely changed, and with scores of wholly new-coined words staring him in the face, and some of them looking out in bold effrontery from every page of his Greek Testament? One who can do that can do anything to support a bad cause and a weak argument.”

“O, Anna, is it possible! I always supposed that Pedobaptists were the inconsistent ones, claiming for this word βαπτίζω what they could not claim, and did not claim of another word in the whole New Testament. One would think so, from what it says here.”

“True, that is the impression conveyed, but it is utterly false. Now after your author gets the argument fixed up in this shape, just see how he applies it on page 151. He imagines that he has got the conviction fast and strong in the mind of his reader, that neither Luke nor the other writers of the New Testament would dare to take the least liberty in extending the meaning of a word for fear they would not be *understood*, even though the language as then used by Greek writers

was utterly destitute of a spiritual element; and almost everything was spiritual that they labored to express. Still Luke, as well as the others, the most learned of the Evangelists, and of all the Apostles save Paul, must bind his thoughts and feelings down to dead words and definitions already coined—having only heathen significations—or else keep them to himself! But after these things had been duly impressed upon the mind of Luke; and with all the care that we can imagine he would exercise in expressing himself *à la mode* Greek; and even with the weighty alternative too that our friend urges and places before him, that unless he confines himself *strictly*, he will be guilty of conveying an absolute falsehood; yet we find that in many very troublesome ‘figures of speech,’ as our friend calls them, he so far forgets himself, and what he is talking about, although ‘inspired by infinite wisdom,’ as to make exceedingly dark and doubtful references to this act called immersion; so dark and doubtful, indeed, that I am afraid the people had the greatest possible difficulty in tracing the connection between them—from one to the other.

“But our great expounder of the Baptist faith here very kindly overlooks this in Luke, simply remarking that the ‘allusion must be in some way or other to immersion, or some circumstance attending immersion. On this alone would its beauty and appropriateness as a figure depend.’ A figure of what—will the author inform us? When John said, ‘I baptize you with water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost,’ did he expect to be understood that his own was a *real, literal* baptism, and his Lord’s a mere fancy—a figure of speech? Or did he mean that the first was a *real, literal water baptism*, and the other a *real, literal Spirit baptism*, the first being used to impress upon our minds the nature and effect of the other? But here our Baptist friend assumes to interpret, after this novel manner, God’s word, which is a revelation to us of spiritual things only, and in which material things are used simply as

vehicles of spiritual impressions. He lays hold of a material ordinance, and instead of carrying it up to its spiritual fount, there to contemplate its beauty and harmony, he drags it off to a foreign court to have its length, breadth, height and depth, determined upon, and works himself up to a fever heat in attempting to adjust the spiritual thing symbolized, to the newly-acquired dimensions. Although utterly unable to make out a fit for it, by giving a pull here and a tuck there, yet he solaces himself as follows: 'We have settled the meaning of this word by its *real, literal*, every-day usage, and we cannot unsettle it by a *figure of speech*—a chance allusion or comparison.' (!) That certainly is very coolly disposing of the Lord's baptism. To be consistent he must take the Lord's Supper, and treat it in the same manner! Drag this ordinance into a Greek court, and there having idolators and heathens sitting as umpires as in the other case, have its meaning determined upon in like manner! The words βαπτίζω and δειπνόν, say your judges, were used hundreds of years before this Christian book was thought of,—their meaning is well fixed and defined, as much so as any other words in our language; and as you use our words, you must confine yourselves to our definitions—indeed, we shall refuse to understand you, if you attempt to extend their meaning, or to generalize their signification. By βαπτίζω, we mean only the act of *being dipped*. By δειπνόν, we mean only the act of *taking a full meal*, in which we eat and drink to satiety. Now you understand the matter, and we hope you will let it rest."

"Is it possible," exclaimed Mary, "that that is the meaning of the word supper, as used in this connection?"

"It is the literal, classical meaning," replied Anna. "The Lord's Supper means a *full meal*, just as much as the Lord's baptism means *immersion*. And this is all the author's great parade of Greek authorities amounts to! Why do'nt he compare Scripture with Scripture, and thus determine the meaning of terms as used by the New Testament writers?"

“But the Lord’s baptism,” said Mary, “was a Spirit baptism.”

“What possible difference can that make in this matter? It was a *baptism*—the word βαπτίζω was used to express it. Jesus said, ‘John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.’ What John did to his disciples with water, shall be done to you with the Holy Ghost. And Peter said the Holy Ghost *fell* on them, as on us at the beginning, then remembered I this promise. When I am baptized, I shall receive it as a symbol of the Holy Ghost baptism, whose influences I trust I have already felt within my soul; and I must receive it in that manner that will perfectly symbolize it according to the teachings of God’s word. If the Spirit falls or descends upon the soul—and so says the word of God—then as water is used as a type of the Spirit’s descent, it also should fall or descend upon me. If the Spirit is applied *to* the soul—and this we are taught by the Sacred Scriptures—then water should be applied *to* the person—to me. I cannot consent to be applied to it, *i. e.*, dipped under it, for that is not in harmony with what we are taught. If the Holy Ghost is used as an instrument or agent—and who will deny that it is through his instrumentality that the soul is regenerated?—then water must be used as an instrument when I am baptized. But I am willing that others should reason and decide for themselves. I would not influence you, Mary, only to lead you to investigate the subject, that you may be led into the truth, and know the *reason* of the faith that is in you.”

“Thank you,” replied Mary; “you have always been a friend to me, and I receive this as an additional proof of your regard for my best interests. You have given me the key-note; and I will endeavor to harmonize everything to it. I perceive this to be a work of 399 pages, written upon the *form* of an outward rite, with not a lisp of its spiritual significance.”

“Yes,” responded Anna; “and it is just as valuable as any other work would be of an equal number of pages treating

upon the form of the Lord's Supper—giving minute directions as to the quality and quantity of bread and wine—insisting that it shall be of sufficient quantity to produce satiety according to the meaning of the word *δειπνόν*, definitely indicating the posture of the body and the manner of swallowing, with nothing whatever about discerning the Lord's body! And whether such a work would be a blessing or a curse to the world, I would be willing to submit to any intelligent and consistent Christian living. Instead of closing the breach now separating the different branches of Christ's church, or tending to this effect—it but widens and deepens it—and embitters the feelings of his own branch, and renders more hostile their attitude and bearings towards their more consistent and peaceable neighbors.

“I have no doubt that many persons take upon themselves the ordinance of baptism without anything like an intelligent Scriptural view of its significancy and use; having vague and undigested ideas of peculiar virtues being bestowed by it; or else regarding it simply as an initiatory rite, by which they become members of a certain church, or rather by which they embrace and subscribe to the tenets of a particular sect. O what a prostitution is this of God's ordinances! Is such a sin of ignorance to be winked at when there is a Bible in every house, and almost in every hand? If all were taught to regard the ordinance of baptism as an outward sign of faith in the agency of the Holy Ghost upon the soul—received as a gift from the Father through the atonement of the Son—for Jesus said, ‘When the Comforter is come whom *I* will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father,’—would they not often pause, and fear to lay hands suddenly upon holy things? Would they not tremble lest they sin against the Holy Ghost, knowing that it never can be forgiven them?”

“O, Anna, Anna, I have been guilty of just this thing! I had no higher views of this ordinance than merely to regard it as a *form* I must go through in order to become a church member. I had no conception of its spiritual usage! May God forgive me, for I discover it must have been offensive and sinful, so to regard it, in the eyes of a holy God, who is a Spirit, and seeketh spiritual worshippers. May God forgive me!” again sobbed Mary.

“The orb of day,

In southern climes, o'er ocean's waveless field
Sinks sweetly smiling; not the faintest breath
Steals o'er the unruffled deep; the clouds of eve
Reflect unmoved the lingering beam of day;
And vesper image on the western main
Is beautifully still. To-morrow comes;
Cloud upon cloud, in dark and deepening mass,
Roll o'er the blacken'd waters; the deep roar
Of distant thunder mutters awfully;
Tempest unfolds its pinion o'er the gloom
That shrouds the boiling surge; the pitiless fiend,
With all his winds and lightnings, tracks his prey;
The torn deep yawns, — the vessel finds a grave
Beneath its jagged gulf.”

CHAPTER VIII.

“I may stand alone,
But would not change my *free will* for a throne.”

It was late when Anna returned home. She had paused on the summit of the hill to watch the glory of the sunset heavens, and to dream of the glory far beyond the fleecy clouds, an undimmed brightness of *real* glory, not of cold grey mist, whose transitory hues, caught from the sunbeams, fade and vanish as the shadows creep along the earth. The sun went down. The sky, which was kindled with a rosy flush, faded into grey—dull, sombre grey—just as sorrow fades the rose-tinted hopes of mortals. Then came the shadowy train of solemn night which wrapped the earth in gloom, but lit up the heavens with stars. If there were no night, we would not know that there were any stars—it teaches us a lesson. When the sunshine of prosperity suddenly departs, and darkness gathers around us, we can forget how dark it is by looking up, and thus catch the glory of ten thousand suns whose existence we had not dreamed of.

As Anna entered the house, the first glance told her that the clerical trio were awaiting, with some degree of impatience, her arrival. Hardly giving her time to lay aside her bonnet, Brother Burton motioned her to a seat, and began; “Miss Anna, your father desires me to say to you, that it is his wish that you shall attend the Covenant meeting to-morrow, and go

on in the ordinance of baptism with your young friends, Mr. Sims, Miss Sherwood, and Miss Stocher. He desires earnestly to see you take a stand for God in the Christian church, as he thinks it would increase your usefulness; and perhaps your example might be the means of leading others along the same road to heaven."

"As my father is present," replied Anna; "I will reply directly to him, that I would dearly love to gratify him, as it is all I can do—and a small return, indeed—for all his kindnesses; but his request comprehends what is to me a matter of conscience; and he himself has taught me never to hesitate between duty toward God and duty toward man."

"Duty toward God!" replied Brother Burton. "Has not God commanded you to 'honor thy father and thy mother;' and how are you to honor them but by obedience? Again, He says, 'Children, obey your parents;' if you are looking in that direction for guidance, I think you will find your duty pointed out plainly."

"There are some things," replied Anna, "so entirely between an individual soul and its God, that no one can step between, whether he be parent, priest, or king. If a mandate from either conflicts with the promptings of an enlightened conscience regarding duty toward God—the command must yield, and conscience must triumph. If it was simply a question between my will and his will involving nothing more to either, then mine should yield to his. If I was simply required to join *some church*, it would not conflict with my understanding of God's word, and I should feel in duty bound to comply; but before I can yield to a requirement to join a *particular church*, I must be convinced that that particular church is right, that her doctrines are in harmony with my understanding of God's truth."

Spoken like my Anna, thought Elder Clayton, but he prudently kept his thoughts to himself.

“If that principle should be universally acted upon,” said Elder Burton, “everything would be a matter of conscience, and there would be an end of parental authority and civil government. Your father’s request runs parallel with God’s commands, and it is your father’s duty to see that you comply. God requires you to separate yourself from the world, and to do it *now*. Your father requires you to do it *now*. A month, or six months hence, is not Gospel time. But if you refuse, and persist in disobedience, you must expect to reap the bitter fruits of disobedience. Listen to the law of God respecting such rebellion against parental authority.”

Brother Burton opened the family Bible that lay upon the center-table, and turning to Deut. xxi. 18, read: “If a man have a stubborn and rebellious son, which will not obey the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother, and that when they have chastened him, will not hearken unto them; then shall his father and his mother lay hold on him, and bring him out unto the elders of his city, and unto the gate of his place; and they shall say unto the elders of his city, This our son is stubborn and rebellious, he will not obey our voice: And all the men of his city shall stone him with stones that he die.” Brother Burton read this with the solemnity of a judge pronouncing the sentence of death upon a criminal at the bar; then closed the book and rising to his feet, turned toward Anna with an air that was expected to be impressive, and said, “Now you discover, Miss Clayton, what you may expect from the court to which you appeal. The law of God leaves no excuse for you, and I trust you see under what a mistaken idea you have been laboring, and that you will go on and do your duty as an affectionate and dutiful child should, in the fear of the Lord. But if you do not, you can hardly expect to share the affections and favors of those whose authority you despise. They have taken you—a poor orphan, houseless and friendless—to the comforts of their own house, have watched over you in sickness and in

health, and supplied all your wants with a parent's tenderness, and are still seeking to guide your young feet into the paths of peace and virtue. If such care and kindness is to be met with ingratitude and rebellion, they can hardly be expected to continue it longer."

This touched Anna to the quick: she trembled violently, and turned her eyes, half blinded with tears, toward her foster father — her more than father, as she often called him in the fondness of her heart, longing to assure him of her love and gratitude for his care; but his eyes were fixed on the floor, and she could read nothing from his rigid features. She looked around pleadingly in search of a kindly glance, but there was not one to greet her. Mother Clayton was intent upon her knitting-work; Father Longwind looked abstractedly from the open window; Brother Burton's eyes, glowing with expected triumph, were searching her with an eager watch for prey; and George and Halley were not there — O, why had they gone away? thought the troubled, lonely, helpless Anna. The clinging vine reaches in vain for support, it leans on empty space, a worse than broken reed. Trail not upon the earth, thou vine, but lift thy head trustingly towards heaven; lay hold upon that Rock whose support shall not fail thee — Anna, look up to God! Anna did look up to her heavenly Father with an earnest though silent cry for help and guidance — and she was no longer alone.

"Of course you can have time to think of this," continued Elder Burton, judging from her agitation and silence that she was ready to yield. "We shall expect your final decision in the morning — whether you choose duty in obedience and the continued regard of your parents and friends, or a path of disobedience, and the world before you — a wanderer!"

Elder Clayton started nervously, and glanced inquiringly, almost pleadingly, at Anna: indeed, every eye was arrested now, and fixed on her in anxious waiting for the reply. Anna

trembled a little at first, and her lip quivered, but in a moment she looked up calmly, steadily, and replied that it would not be well to wait for the morrow — she was ready to decide now.

“Then let us have your decision,” said Elder Burton, quite haughtily, and with an air of triumph.

“The act of immersion,” responded Anna, at first in quite a subdued but calm voice, which grew firmer as she proceeded—“would be to me a senseless form. I should not feel that I was obeying my Savior, but disobeying him. By uniting with you I should subscribe to what I do not believe—I should come before God with a lie in my mouth, and I know He would abominate the offering. I cannot—I dare not!

“My father,” she continued, turning to him, “you have never found me in past years stubborn and rebellious, then do not judge me harshly now. ’Tis true I owe you much, I would not hesitate to pay that debt with any sacrifice of worldly good—I’d even give my life, but *I dare not lie to God!* I will go.”—

Had a thunder-bolt fallen within the circle, they could not have been more surprised than they were at her determined manner, and her unyielding decision. She had already passed the door.

“Anna! Anna! Come back, child! What can you do out in the cold world? No, no, you shall not be driven away! Your dying mother’s pale face haunts me now; come back, Anna! You need not believe what you can find no reason for believing!”

Anna’s heart was touched—the transition which came over her feelings unloosed the fountains of her tears afresh, and in trembling accents she exclaimed:

“My father! May God bless you, my father—my more than father!”

“Not a word about that—I’ve been cruel and harsh, unfeelingly harsh! My child, my Anna, come back! This roof shall

shelter you as long as it shelters me! I do not believe in being driven, as a beast is driven to the water. Come back, child, and let us reason the matter together. Do not fear to speak honestly, for I will not force the conscience of any one; tell us plainly why it is you cannot go with us?"

"I do not believe," replied Anna, re-entering the room and seating herself modestly by her kind-hearted foster-father, "that the Baptist church is the only Gospel church, nor could I in my conscience exclude other Christians from the communion."

"Ah, that is it? Well, I do'nt know—let's see—have you read this book?—this is what I call a fair exposition of the matter."

"Yes, father, I have read it."

"What, and not convinced? I fear, my child, you are incorrigible," said the Elder, smilingly.

"To support your claims of being the only true church," replied Anna, "you must prove that immersion was John's baptism, that immersion was the apostles' baptism, that immersion was the Holy Ghost baptism; and after proving this, which is not proved in that book, and which never was proved, then you must prove that the *form* of immersion is essential to the ordinance, so that it would not be acceptable to God without it."

"Well, is not that proved here, Anna?"

"It is not, father; nor can it be anywhere, because God has decided otherwise. Is he not a proper Judge of what is acceptable to him?"

"Certainly, my child, certainly."

"Does he not accept and bless other churches as churches, giving them precious outpourings of his Spirit? Does he not bring sinners with humble, broken hearts, into their folds, equally as into the pale of the Baptist church? Dare you dictate to God just what he shall recognize? Dare you prescribe terms for the Almighty?"

“Not so fast, Anna; I’m sure we have no desire to do any such thing.”

“But do you not do it when you say, ‘Our church is the only church which should be recognized as a Gospel church.’ Listen, dear father, to the voice of God, pealing like the thunders from Sinai. ‘I place my seal on all those who are acceptable to me.’ Listen! it is not *all* of any name: there are many who have a name to live and are dead, but where my Spirit is there am I to bless. Do you see hard hearts melting before an unseen power? Do you see stout hearts trembling before a still small voice? Do you hear Christians praying, and do you see sinners weeping? There am *I*—that is *my seal*—those are mine. And shall those whom God recognizes and accepts refuse to commemorate together the death of their common Lord? For shame! for shame! O, it seems to me that I can see Jesus standing before the Throne of the Father, with bleeding hands and streaming side, pleading, ‘O Father, grant that they may *all* be *one*, as thou art in me, and I in thee. O Father, make them *one* in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. Dare I place a pebble in the way of the fulfilment of that prayer? God forbid! rather let my hand wither, and my tongue palsy!

“But what shall I say of those who roll mountains between the members of Christ’s body, and build a partition wall with which they would fain fence the Almighty within? God forgive them, but I would not *dare* do thus—nor dare I hold my peace, for if I should my heart would consume with grief: as long as God giveth me breath, I will not cease to denounce this separation of the members of Christ’s church!”

“O Anna, Anna—I’m sure you present the case too strongly. We act upon the same principles that other denominations act upon. We believe, it is true, that a person must be baptized before being admitted to the communion-table, and we believe that immersion is the only baptism; so how can we do differently

from what we do? We act upon the same principles that others do; we only differ about baptism—about what constitutes baptism. We believe it is being dipped under water, and others believe it to be either sprinkling, or pouring, or immersion—they admit all they consider baptized, and we admit all we consider baptized—do'nt you see there is no difference?"

"I need no process of reasoning," replied Anna, "to convince me that those rules are wrong whose workings are so disastrous to the cause of religion among men, as to exclude from fellowship and communion the larger part of that body of professing Christians whom God himself recognizes—mark the assertion—whom *God recognizes* as members of his family—not those who may simply profess. And there should be no tests used but those that shall decide whether they are recognized by God or not. Those churches which God builds up and strengthens—those churches where God pours out his spirit and revives his work in the hearts of his people, and converts sinners from the error of their ways, are *God's churches*, are *Gospel churches*—no matter by what name known, no matter how baptized!

"There are churches, or those professing to be such, where God never appears; where his presence in the third person of the Trinity is never known, where the Holy Spirit is not even recognized—*throw them out*: you can do it with all safety, for they are not recognized by God. But beware how you draw lines upon those with whom God deigns to dwell, lest you be found contending with God, and stir him up in his anger! I can see that there is a difference in the working of your principles and the principles of your neighbors. In one case the door is thrown open, not to the whole world, but to *all* of God's family—all whom *he* recognizes as such; *they* are invited to assemble in *one body*, to meet around *one table*, and to remember there the sufferings and death of their common Lord; but in the other case the door is shut upon the greater part of them

with a nudge and 'Stand aside, I am, in some way, holier than thou!' That is the principle I condemn! If you were not more controlled by a love of *forms and ceremonies*, than by the Spirit of the Gospel, you would not allow a mere form to step in and cause a separation. Nor does it grow necessarily out of your baptism. Separation was not a necessary consequence with such men (Baptist men) as Robert Hall, John Bunyan, Baptist Noel, and others. And these very men, although Baptists and *regularly immersed*, you consider outside the pale of your church — Christ's church — because they insisted upon recognizing as brethren whom God recognized as children.

"It is not enough according to the practice of your church that a person be a pious Baptist in good and regular standing in his own church, but he must belong to *the church* or be excluded from Communion. No, no, it is not a *formal baptism* that is a prerequisite to Communion, that lies at the bottom of this exclusiveness: it is rather the Papal error of confining Christ's church within the borders of your own denomination! You say that like all other denominations you require *only* evidences of conversion and baptism—this is not true, for when both are given you, even then you refuse the applicant. If Bunyan himself stood at your door dripping with baptismal waters, you would say, 'No, sir! you must join *the church* or you cannot commune.' Why is this, if you do not require something besides the evidences of conversion and baptism? Would it not be more Christian-like to receive those whom Christ receives to the *real* Communion? For you all unhesitatingly confess that Christ does indeed receive those, with whom there may be, in fact, informality in the mere act of profession; if Christ, then, receives them to the *real substance*, what authority have you to separate them from the shadow? 'What God hath cleansed call not thou common or unclean.' Would it *grieve* our blessed Master, that all, whom he recognizes as those he hath redeemed by his blood and engrafted into his

own body, *unite* in showing forth his death until he come — *unite* in celebrating that ordinance by himself appointed to symbolize the great ransom he has paid to obtain for us so glorious a hope? Did he not command a unity of action here among all his true followers, when he said ‘Take ye *all* of it?’ If he found his church thus, would he not bestow his benediction and increase its borders? His prayer would then be, as in the days of his sojourn here with his disciples, ‘Holy Father, I know thou hearest me always; now hast thou made them one; as thou Father art in me and I in thee, now have they become *one in us.*’ Great God!” exclaimed Anna, in accents and with that earnestness that thrilled the nerves of the listeners, for her lofty enthusiasm was stirred to its central depths, and raising her outstretched arms toward heaven, repeated, “Great God! speed thou that blessed hour! Speak thou to the Christian world, as thou didst of old to thy people from the burning mount. Let thy voice of mighty thunders rock the earth, that thy people may know that thou God art a sovereign and dost *command* them to love one another, or they are none of thine! O blessed Jesus, exhibit thou to them the price of their purchase! May they see thine agony in the garden when the pressure of Almighty wrath with the sins of the world bowed thee to the dust! May they see what thou hast suffered in thy wounded hands and feet and bleeding side! May they feel nature’s conscious shudder that rent the rocks and veiled the sun, when God, the Mighty Maker, lifted up his voice and cried, ‘’Tis finished’ — the work is done! O may they then remember how thou didst pray, ‘Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given to me, that they may be *one* as we are *one.*’ Great God, may those who truly love thee, seek to do thy will by moulding the hearts of Christians together. May those who have taken upon themselves solemn vows, look to their ways, lest they put their Master to an open shame in the house of his friends, and become a wall

of separation over which the unbelieving shall stumble into hell! O make thy people *one*, blessed Jesus! that the world may *believe* that thou art a lost world's Friend!"

Anna slowly turned away, and passed out to the solitude of her own chamber. Others passed out, one by one, and soon all having retired, darkness and stillness reigned supreme. The stars watched out the night, and the morrow dawned. In due time came the Covenant meeting, which passed without unusual incident, as no one presented himself as a candidate for church membership; and through it all Elder Clayton walked as one in a dream. He did what he was expected to do, he said what he was expected to say, but his heart was not in it. "A wall of separation over which the unbelieving shall stumble into hell!" this was an ever-present thought.

The Sabbath came with its solemn train of ceremonies, and found him the same. Once he started as with a sudden pain, for his eye fell on the bowed head of an aged man who had just been passed by; and he remembered how he loved to hear that man pray. "As ye have done it unto the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." Was not that the voice of the Master of the feast?

The eye of God was scanning the thoughts of this aged man. He was thinking—for twenty years I have attended regularly the meetings of this church. Every Sabbath morning has found me in my seat. Every Sabbath evening has witnessed to my voice raised in exhortation and prayer. For twenty years of successive communion seasons have I seen the bread broken and wine poured out, solemn emblems of my suffering, dying Lord, and I have been passed by! Then he thought how near he was to his eternal rest: his eyes were dim, his limbs were tottering; a few more successive Sabbaths, and—he would no longer be passed by—home at last, in heaven, he would sit at a table spread by his Master's own hands!

"A wall of separation over which the unbelieving shall

stumble into hell"—thought Elder Clayton, as he watched the elements in their round. He could not help the re-occurrence of this thought, it seemed forced upon him. Strange he had never marked before, how many there were in his congregation of praying Christians, who were passed by.

Later in the day there was a stir around the Academy place. This small building was surmounted by a cupola in which hung a bell, and it was now pealing out its notes of invitation, and the inhabitants were thronging in. "Who is it? who is it?" was asked by one and another.

"I do'nt know his name," replied Father Benjamin; "but it is an open Communionist. For twenty years have I waited to see this day, and I have seen it, and am glad!"

"Can we have a Communion?" This question was asked with eager earnestness by those who had not enjoyed the privilege for years, some of them but once or twice in their whole Christian life. "Can we have a Communion?" they repeated.

"I will see," responded Father Benjamin; and he climbed the steps to the speaker's seat, and soon returned with the joyful news, "We *can* have a Communion."

The house was soon filled up, and after the singing of a hymn and prayer, the speaker arose and announced his text; John xv. 10-12, "If ye keep my commandments ye shall abide in my love, even as I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in his love. This is my commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you." "Love," said he, "is the fulfilling of the law. It is the burden of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Love to God and love to man is the sum total of man's duty. In our text we are taught, first, that if we keep the commandments of our Master, we shall be loved by him, even as he is loved by his Father who sitteth upon the throne in heaven; and this is the commandment we are to keep, to love one another as he hath loved us." The main drift of this discourse was to show what it was to abide in Christ's love, and

what were the exhibitions of his love toward us. But there were a few thoughts, in the latter division of the subject, showing how Christians should love one another, that we cannot pass over so hastily. "When the full power of Christianity is known, the manifestations of it will appear in the triumph of Christian love among the followers of Jesus, by making the peculiarities of the various Evangelical denominations now existing, *secondary* to Christian union and effort. The union of Christians in spite of the diversity in their forms and creeds, will be, to the world, the greatest proof of the divine origin of Christianity ever given to man. And in view of their past alienations and contentions, that union of fellowship and action will appear the greatest instance of the presence and power of God on earth.

"The preferences of different orders and forms of worship will then be sunk into mere matters of taste and education, and all who hold to the essential doctrines of the Gospel, will show the earnest of heaven in their feelings and conduct toward each other. The *true* church will then appear to consist of such as the Father seeks to worship him, confined to no sect, but representing, by its diffusion among many, and at the same time its spiritual union, the society of heaven made up of every kindred, and tongue, and people. Who does not believe that such a day will come? What Christian heart does not leap at the sound of its coming, 'as the hart panteth for the water brooks'? Shall the morning of the Millennium break upon the church, and find the different divisions of her hosts embattled against each other? No, this can never be! The time *will* come when each denomination of Christians will freely commune with, and love all others, without requiring conformity to their own modes and practices, if indeed they see exhibited in their lives and conduct, the Spirit of the true religion. But the Spirit of Christianity is yet like a beautiful captive in bonds. Many sects in Christendom have laid their

chains upon her, and what wars and fightings have been the consequence! Sad profanation of the Christian name and Spirit!

“To Jesus Christ and to the angels, I know not which is the most revolting sight, the rites and practices of heathenism, or the contentions of a divided wrangling Christendom! But her day of liberty is near. Rising in the view of angels and men, and holding forth her fallen chains, she will yet appear invested with spiritual and celestial beauty; and as each invokes and claims her as his own, she will spread herself abroad in heavenly light, and surveying the people of the Lord under their various names and forms, will bless them and cry, ‘Above all, and through all, and in you all—the Lord’s children—in the Spirit of peace, and the unity of purpose!’ May the Lord hasten this in his time. Spirit of Christ escape from our chains! Let each of us take from off thy celestial form, whatever sectarian band we may have woven around, and bid thee hold communion with *all* of every name, who differ in rites and forms from us, but with us hold to the essential grounds of a sinner’s hope!”

The sermon was ended—or rather the minister ceased speaking. The sermon is not ended, nor will it be till the triumph of the last day. Many hearts echoed to its teachings, and a spark of Christian love was kindled there, that God grant, may meet kindred sparks until the flame of Christian love and unity be kindled and spread over the face of the whole earth.

Anna — for Anna was there — felt like crying, as did the souls beneath the altar, “O Lord, how long! how long!” And Father Benjamin bowed his head and wept. The minister, at the close of his discourse, broke the bread and poured out the wine; and after referring to its significance and use, said: “My Christian friends, let angels look down upon the scene, and witness that Christians of every name have gathered around the table of their suffering, dying Lord.” Not another word

was spoken. The elements were silently passed, and every soul was busy with its own communings. Then they arose and sang this hymn, and went out.

“Lord! I am thine, entirely thine,
Purchased and saved by blood divine;
With full consent thine I would be,
And own thy sovereign right to me.

Grant me, in mercy, now, a place
Among the children of thy grace,—
A wretched sinner, lost to God,
But ransom'd by Immanuel's blood.

Thee my new Master, now I call,
And consecrate to thee my all;
Lord! let me live and die to thee,
Be thine through all eternity.”

“Have you been to the sprinklers' meeting?” asked mother Clayton.

“I have,” Anna replied.

“Well, what did they do there?”

“They worshipped God.”

“No, I mean,” repeated mother Clayton, rather sharply, “have they appointed any more meetings? I suppose the Rev. Mr. Wise will stay here now, to enlighten the people, and pick up all the young converts. Was Mary Stocher there?”

“She was.”

“And Maria Sherwood?”

“Yes,” answered Anna.

“And Peter Sims?”

“Yes.”

“Why were they not baptized to-day?”

“I do not know. I have not spoken with either of them.”

Mother Clayton was sadly puzzled to account for it. Brother Burton had felt it his duty to look around a little; but mother

Clayton was too impatient to wait for his return, so she put on her bonnet, and called over at neighbor Stocher's.

"Anna!" called Elder Clayton, opening the door of his study. Anna answered the call, and passed as quickly as possible up the stairs and into his room. "Anna! I have been praying over the matter, and I know it an't right. I never can exclude Christians of other denominations from Communion again — never!"

"Thank God!" exclaimed Anna, in the fervor of her soul.

"There is widow Giles," continued Elder Clayton; "and Father Benjamin, who in my opinion stand better in the sight of God, to-day, than I ever did, or ever can, with all my forms and precisions; and to shut them out from the Lord's table — our table we call it — when they cannot have access to any other, must be an abomination in the sight of God; and if God will forgive me for what is past, I never will commit such a crime again."

"Thank God!" repeated Anna, her eyes filling with tears. "My dear father, how it gladdens my heart that you have thus been led to view this matter! My prayers have truly been answered."

"There is Mrs. Briggs, too," he continued; "she once belonged here, and was one of our most spiritual-minded members, but became dissatisfied with Close Communion, because it drew the line of separation upon her pious father and mother, under whose prayers and teachings she was converted; she left us and joined the 'Free Wills,' ten miles from here. Now she is one with us in prayer meetings and conference meetings, and even in our covenant meetings; but at Communion she must stand aside, and yet we know her to be a baptized Christian. I baptized her myself, and she is still a Baptist. You are right, my dear child, we do require something more than conversion and baptism as prerequisites of Communion."

"Yes, father," replied Anna; "and still this doctrine cannot

be traced to any definite principle. They say at one time, 'It is not close Communion, but close baptism;' yet they persist in excluding those whom they acknowledge as baptized Christians. Then to cover up this inconsistency, they fly to the ground 'This is a church ordinance, and none but *regular* Baptist churches are churches of Christ, and have a right to a seat at the Lord's table.' Thus in their strait they fall into the Papal error respecting the outward visible Catholic church — 'There is no church but the *regular* Baptist church.'

'And yet it is such a church organization as to exclude the great majority of those who are admitted to be genuine Christians—a church *out of* which salvation, according to their own admission, is more abundant than within it! This is a more glaring inconsistency than the other! 'Christ's errand was to set up a *visible church*,' says that volume which you consider a fair exposition of your faith. Christ came to set up a *visible church*, and the *regular Baptist church is the church he set up*. The object to be gained in the setting up of a visible church, was to mark the *outlines* between the world and the people of God; and yet for some reason (not given by our Nashville friend), our Savior made such an unaccountable blunder in the arrangement of the matter, that after all his labors, his sufferings and death — after all his trouble of coming to this sin-cursed world for the express purpose of making a division—of erecting a wall of separation between the devil's kingdom and his own; after all this, still by far the greater part of his spiritual ones, his praying ones, his laborers and martyrs, are on the wrong side of the line! They are *without* the pale of his church still! What kind of a Savior is this the Baptists worship! is he the Savior of the Bible? Rome with all her inconsistencies has not one like this! *She* claims that her church is Christ's church, and that his followers are *all in it*, not the greater share of them *out of it*. The Baptists say we acknowledge you are a converted man, and belong to *Christ's invisible*

church, and will go to heaven as well as the *best* of us. We even acknowledge that you have been regularly baptized, for we saw you dipped; but still you can't approach the Lord's table, even though he said, 'Take *ye all*, of it.' Why? because we are going to force you to go with us or to disobey your Master!"

"No, Anna, not *quite* so bad as that; they can have communion among themselves, you know."

"But you do'nt recognize their Communion *as* Communion. You say it is a church ordinance, and that there is no church but the Baptist church; all else are nothing but societies according to your principles, and have no *right* to Communion. If you do not believe that this is your doctrine, look in that book, which you call a fair exposition of your faith: the doctrine there stands out on every page devoted to this subject. See also the *Baptist Christian Review* for April, 1858; there it is on the table. It says, 'Their churches are not churches, but societies; their ministers are not ministers, they are in no proper sense ordained at all, they have no ministerial character. If you exchange with them and invite them to your pulpit, there is no recognition of their clerical character. Their rank is merely that of *good* men—not members of churches.' And moreover the Reviewer, whilst denying that 'Pedobaptist Societies' are churches, and that they have any authorized ministry, and whilst pleading on this ground their exclusion from Baptist Communion, declares that they *may* and *ought* to commune among themselves!" He forgets that the Communion is a 'Church ordinance, and confined exclusively to churches;' he forgets that he makes this, that his church makes this one of their great cardinal principles and reasons of exclusiveness! O consistency, thou art, indeed, a jewel!

"They shift their premises under a pressure, like the drifting quicksands. If a Pedobaptist presents himself, they say it is not close Communion, but close baptism—You can't come, sir, you have not been baptized! When an immersionist—one who

has been regularly and properly dipped—presents himself, they say, ‘O, it an’t the dipping so much that lies at the bottom of it. You can’t come, sir; you do’nt belong to *the church*’—that’s the long and short of it! But if you stop to reason with them, and ask by what authority, by what right do you claim the Communion all to yourselves, and declare ours to be a solemn mockery? ‘O, we won’t be so hard-hearted as that,’ they answer; ‘you *may* commune among yourselves, if you’ve a mind to.’

“‘Thank you, sir, for the privilege, but I thought it was a *church ordinance*, and that there was *no church but the Baptist church!*’

“‘O, well, we had forgotten about that; why, how you do bother us! But you can’t come with *us*, sir, *it is against our principles!* Do’nt you know, sir, what our great Andrew Fuller said? Why, sir, he said, “The tendency of mixed Communion is to annihilate, *as such*, all the Baptist churches in Christendom! Do you wish to promote the dissolution and ruin of the *Baptist denomination as such?* If you do not, take heed to your ways.” Is not this a sufficient caution? Shall we not heed the warning coming from, not only such a man as Andrew Fuller, but also from all learned Baptist divines? So you see you can’t sit down with *us*, sir, at the Lord’s table—let this settle the matter—and now, please just let us alone!’”

‘Elder Clayton leaned his head upon his hand, and communed with his own thoughts. “Anna,” he said at length, “it is true, every word of it; and I never can do it again. For twenty years have I been advocating such principles, and really I did not know what I was advocating.”

“If you should choose the other alternative,” continued Anna, “and admit that ‘Pedobaptist Societies’ *are churches*, as they claim to be, then, you know, the Supper belongs to churches, and consequently they have a *legal right* to commune, as much so as a Baptist church: and further, it would be no

more illegal for a Baptist to commune with them, than with any Baptist church of which he is not a member. If they are churches, they have an equal right to it with Baptist churches—a right to it wherever and whenever the table is spread.”

“You are right, Anna,” said Elder Clayton; “and henceforth, and ever after, I must be an open communionist. But the baptism—I do’nt know but other people have a right to their notions; somehow I like to have mine, and immersion suits me the best of anything.”

“Then stick to your notions, for no one need to complain as long as you grant others the same privileges you claim for yourself. Answer for your own notions to God, and let others do the same. We, I mean those who believe in Pedobaptism and sprinkling, find no fault with Baptists because they prefer a different *form* from us, although we are firmly convinced that our way is the true Gospel way, as much so as you Baptists can be that yours is the same. We are willing to concede to you your right of conscience; and all we claim is the same right conceded to us. We have not labored to convince you that sprinkling is the Bible mode of baptism for the purpose of hurling our anathemas at you, and of unchurching you, if you are not convinced and do not immediately conform to our views; but simply to convince you that you are doing a *great wrong* in acting upon that principle toward us.

“Because you have failed to convince us that your way has more Bible authority than ours, why do you unchurch us? Why do you say, you must go with us and do as we do, or we will not allow you to be called, recognized or treated as a church, and as church members? Why do you hold up your hands with pious horror, and cry out ‘impious,’ ‘sacrilegious,’ ‘high-handed rebellion against God,’ just because our ceremonies are different from yours? Would you justify it in us, when your ceremonies are different from ours, when God recognizes *us all* as his family, and declares us to be *one body* with Christ Jesus

for the Great Head? Jesus said, 'When the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, he shall *testify* of me.' Jesus sends him as a witness, and you refuse his testimony. He says, These in whose presence I come to dwell are members of Christ's body, Jesus hath sent me to bear witness of this truth; but still you Baptists say *that can't be possible!* We think there must be some mistake about that, because, you see, we can prove quite conclusively that we Baptists *are this Body*, are his church, and as these others are not Baptists, therefore they can't be his church!

"O, how must this appear in the sight of God! How dare you thus give the lie to the testimony of the Spirit of Truth! May God forgive you!

"It is as though the youngest of many brothers should become possessed of the strange idea that he alone of all the brothers should bear his father's name in the family. His brothers would reason with him thus—'Have we not always been acknowledged by the same parents, sheltered by the same roof, and fed at the same table?'

"'Why, yes, to be sure! We have, it is true, been brought up together, but that do'nt prove that you also should be called by the name of Smith. I tell you that I alone am to represent our father's name to the world.'

"'But would you drive us from our father's house, and rob us of our heirship?'

"'O, no, I *can't* do any such thing as that: I expect that you will live here as long as I do, and have equal shares in the estate; but you are not a going to be called Smith—that's all!'

"'But does not our father call us Smith? He says, Ben Smith, Jacob Smith, Peter Smith, and he calls you John Smith; and is not his recognition of us as children, sufficient warrant for us to claim the name, as well as the estate?'

“No, sir; I tell you, *I'm Smith*, and you are simply Ben, Jacob, and Peter!”

“Now this is the way our Baptist friends argue, and this is just the position they take in the great Christian family. They are ever contending for the sole claim to the name Smith. They do not dispute that their brethren are lawfully born into the kingdom—born of the Spirit—they do not dispute that they will share the inheritance, as equal, legal heirs, with themselves, but they sha'nt be called Smith! There is no Smith but John Smith—there is no church but the Baptist church!”

“Do'nt say another word about that, Anna, and I will never plead up churchism again so long as I live. The fact is, these thoughts are never presented to the masses of the Baptist church: if they were, they would be as repulsive to them as to you. There is not one in fifty who believes that his church is the only church recognized by God as a gospel church. As you say, they only contend for the *name*. I never believed that there was no church but the Baptist church, although I confess to my shame, that I have talked it sometimes, and the doctrine is taught plainly enough in our Articles of Faith; hand them to me, Anna. Here is the article: ‘A church is a body of baptized believers, etc.’ and immediately after it adds: ‘Baptism is an immersion of the whole body in water, etc.’ This you see cuts off all but those who have been immersed, and a part of them are provided for elsewhere.”

“Yes,” replied Anna, “that was the first stone I stumbled over that led me to consider the subject.”

The door opened, and Brother Burton and mother Clayton entered. Mother Clayton's countenance was full of wrath, and with her characteristic impetuosity, she broke forth: “So then, Miss Anna, you've been proselyting! I thought the mischief was in it! Let me catch you at it again, if you think best! Why could'nt you let Mary alone, and not get her on the track to serve the devil too?”

“I have not sought her,” replied Anna, “she sought me. I did not force my principles on her, she drew them from me. Do you call that proselyting?”

“Yes, I do call that proselyting. Let me catch you at it again! I won’t have such a hypocrite——”

“Stop, mother,” interrupted Elder Clayton; “she had a right to tell Mary what her principles were. Her mouth shall not be muzzled, so she dare not and cannot open it.”

Mother Clayton gave her liege lord a glance full of reproachful indignation, and went out. Brother Burton seemed ill at ease. He paced up and down the room, and then said that he would like a private interview with Elder Clayton, whereupon Anna withdrew from the study, and left them alone.

“The mischief is in it!” exclaimed Brother Burton, petulantly. “Everything is going wrong. The truth is, Brother Clayton, you *must* muzzle the girl’s mouth, or you might as well give up the ship. It is just as I told you, two-thirds of the young people will believe anything she tells them.”

“Yes; Anna’s word was always to be depended upon.”

“That meeting this afternoon,” continued Brother Burton, “has had the very worst influence. You should have seen how your church members flocked in to hear him. And I’ve been told that Deacon Sims and his wife both partook of the Communion with them. This matter must be looked into immediately. I will go over there with you to-night—there’s no way but to make an example of them—cut them right off, and then I will preach a sermon or two on the subject, and see if I can’t quiet the dissatisfaction that’s creeping in around, provided you take care of the girl. You’d better send her off at once.”

“I cannot spare Anna,” replied Elder Clayton, “for she is the light of the household: nor can I make an example of Deacon Sims, for if I had been there I would have done the same.”

“What!” exclaimed Elder Burton.

“The fact is, Brother Burton, I am convinced that close Communion is not based on Gospel principles; and I am determined that I will neither be confined to them myself, nor enforce them upon others.”

From Brother Burton’s eyes flashed unutterable thoughts. Surprise and indignation, and even contempt, struggled for the mastery, and for the moment kept him silent.

“I shall go over to Deacon Sims,” continued Elder Clayton, “not to upbraid and condemn him, but to comfort and strengthen. And I hope to find others in my flock, who have enough of the Spirit of Christ in them to recognize Christians as Christians, and fellowship them as such, let them be called by what name they will. And not only recognize individual Christians, but recognize the churches which God recognizes. Henceforward and forever, as long as I live,” he continued, rising to his feet, and looking up as though calling heaven to witness, “I will never lay a straw in the way of Christian fellowship and Communion — God’s grace strengthening me — never, never.”

“Then you are fully determined?” said Elder Burton, through his compressed lips.

“Yes, I am fully determined — nothing can shake me from this purpose.”

“Then you are ready to give up your pastorate? You can no longer be considered a minister of the church of Christ, if you thus trample on her most sacred institutions.”

“Certainly, I shall formally resign my charge; but as God called me to preach his truth, I shall never cease preaching until convinced that God has no more work for me to do.”

“O, yes, you can go and join the Presbyterians or Methodists, and no doubt they will find a fat church for you somewhere; but you must not try to spread your heresy here, sir, for I shall work against you, sir; you need not expect to take your church with you to be sprinkled.”

Elder Clayton felt the old man rising in his throat, but he determinedly swallowed him down again, and replied: "I have no idea of changing my principles, except on the one subject of Communion. I am henceforth, properly speaking, an open Communion Baptist."

"Aha! so you think you can compromise the matter, and serve God and the devil too! But I tell you, Mr. Clayton, it won't go down with either of them. Of all sects, I hate these half-hearted, mealy-mouthed, loose-principled Baptists—they're neither one thing nor the other! If the devil gets any, he'll be sure to get them first!"

Elder Clayton looked at his Brother with surprised indignation. Three days ago he thought him the embodiment of all the Christian graces and virtues, but now how the mask was fallen! Elder Burton was pale with suppressed anger—evidently there were bitter invectives seething in his brain which he dared not utter—hostile animosities springing up in his heart which he dared not express. Elder Clayton gazed upon his troubled and expressive countenance until indignation gave place to pity, and he said: "Elder Burton, it is useless for you and I to talk about this matter. Evidently our paths are now diverging, and it is better for us to part. May God grant that your narrow sect-bound principles be enlarged by the Spirit of the Gospel of Jesus Christ as mine have been, so that you may no longer consider yourself your Master's keeper and dictator, but a servant among fellow-servants. Remember that those who consider themselves the *least*, are the ones who are the greatest in the kingdom of heaven." Thus saying, he turned and went out, leaving the indignant Brother Burton to his own companionship.

The next day a tremendous excitement swept through the town of A——. Brother Burton went from house to house, denouncing the heresy of Elder Clayton and Deacon Sims, and rallying forces to crush them down. A meeting of the church

was called at 3 P. M., to deal with the refractory members, and also public exercises at 7 P. M., when it was expected that Brother Burton would vindicate the peculiarities of their faith, and completely crush out their opponents.

While these arrangements were being made, there was an altogether different scene in Elder Clayton's study. One and another of the parish who sympathized with their pastor, dropped in to assure him of this feeling, until a goodly number were assembled. He told them briefly what led him to a change of sentiment, and then said, "My Brethren and Sisters in Christ Jesus, for twenty years have I had charge of this flock as an under shepherd. I have rejoiced with you when souls have been born into the kingdom; I wept with you when the surges of death bore them from our sight to be here no more forever. And now a few hours hence and this relation will be broken—some other one must fill my place, and break the bread of life to you; but I would like one more season of prayer before this hour arrives. Brothers and sisters let us pray."

The good man kneeled down, surrounded by his friends, and poured out his soul to God, craving his blessing on the church, and the dear precious souls kneeling with him at the mercy-seat. He was always eloquent in prayer; but now the earnestness and depth of his feelings gave tenfold power and beauty to his thoughts and expressions. There was a meekness and pathos in them, too, that touched the hearts of his listeners, moving them even to tears; some even sobbed aloud. Deacon Sims followed his pastor and prayed earnestly for God's blessing to follow the brothers and sisters of the church when he was no longer a member—the church with which he had walked for so many years.

When they arose from their knees it was already time for church meeting, and they repaired directly to the place appointed. The charge was first brought against Deacon Sims. He was asked if he had any confession to make, otherwise they

would be under the necessity of expelling him according to their rules, etc. He replied that what he had done was done from a conviction of *right*—he had acted from a sense of duty to the requirements of God and the rights of his fellow-Christians. He sincerely regretted that this must necessarily lead to a separation of church connection, but he chose rather to suffer that than to violate his conscience. He had no confession to make. His wife made a similar statement, and they were both cut off. Then every eye turned on their pastor. He had always presided over their church meetings—not once for twenty years had he been absent; but now Elder Burton occupied his chair, and he sat on one side as a mere spectator. He did not wait for action to be taken, but arose and said, that God in his providence had made it necessary for him to resign his pastorate; and although it was like giving up the one idol of his heart, yet he desired to be ever ready to obey the voice of God in his soul. An honest change of sentiment would render necessary also a separation of church relations, yet he hoped it would not open a gulf between them so deep that they might not meet in heaven, pastor and people, an unbroken company, there to unite their voices in singing God's praises throughout the endless ages of eternity. The old man broke down and wept; yet it was more from joy at a blessed and unending union in heaven, than grief at the present parting. "See," said he, gathering his voice again; "see, my hair is grey, my head is becoming white for the harvest, I have but a remnant of days left me! Soon I shall go to be with my Master, and I will wait for you there!"

Every heart was touched; the old man, agitated and weeping, yet with such a glorious light beaming from his eyes, seemed to the imaginations of his listeners to be standing betwixt them and the eternal world, with all its untried and fearful realities. With a bold hand he had drawn aside the veil, and let in the light of heaven, before which human passions were silenced

and rebuked. That little tribunal seemed suddenly summoned before the bar of God, and, amid the consternation of each individual soul, they at once forgot who were the accusers and the accused; and when their vote was called for, many of them were silent—there were a few faltering yeas, one or two determined noes, and all the rest were bowed and weeping; for there before them stood accused

Their "Messenger of Truth;
The legate of the skies!—His theme divine,
His office sacred—his credentials clear.
By him the violated law speaks out
Its thunders; and by him, in strains as sweet
As angels use, the Gospel whispers peace."

On the morrow Elder Clayton was waited upon by a committee representing almost the entire body of the church, requesting him to preach to them as in times past. They reported also concerning the meeting in the evening before as follows: that the house was well filled, and Elder Burton preached *one churchism* plainly and undisguisedly, denouncing *pouring* as a relic of Judaism; *sprinkling* as an invention of Popedom; and the baptism of infants—by him called derisively "baby-sprinkling"—as an "impious sacrilege abhorrent to heaven;" and then he rhapsodized eloquently on the "mad men of Munster"—tracing through them and others equally fanatic, *the Baptist church of pure unalloyed faith*, back to the apostles! This was so unpalatable to the congregation, so strange to them, that they concluded their sentiments were about as heretical on these points as their old pastor's, and that they might as well go along in company. Hence the appointment of the committee to request him to continue his ministrations to them. Brother Burton foamed and threatened, but all to no purpose; and so at last he gave in, and departed for a more genial clime and in search of more promising fields.

George and Halley were exceedingly surprised on their

return, at the unlooked-for events which had transpired during their absence.

“Is it possible,” said Halley, “that you have opened your arms to the Christian world?”

“It is the Lord’s doing,” replied Anna, “and it is marvelous in our eyes.”

“Yes,” said Elder Clayton, “I am determined henceforth to be satisfied with the *Lord’s seal*, by which he recognizes and approves those who are acceptable to him. I am satisfied that our distinctions and limitations will be of little avail when the Lord comes in his power and all the holy angels with him to separate the sheep from the goats. My chief concern shall henceforth be to gain an assurance that I am accepted of him, and then as it regards my fellows I will simply look to see if I can discover the *Lord’s seal*, rather than the badge of a particular sect.”

A fervent “Thank the Lord,” was the response from every devout heart.

“Now,” said Halley, “there is a work before you—a glorious work! You say that you desire union among Christians, and that there are Christians of four or five different denominations around you; now call a *union prayer meeting*, and mould their hearts together. Let them bend the knee at one altar, and bear each other up on the wings of prayer before the throne of grace, and they will not go thence to contend about their differences. These union prayer meetings are doing a work for Christendom that nothing else could do—they are the power of God—the means he uses to reconcile and to combine and unite the efforts of his children, his forces, so that they may present an unbroken front to the enemy. And as the God of peace reigneth, we may hope—ay, well believe—that the day is not far distant when Christians will constitute but *one body*, though perhaps bearing different names—one in soul, one in object, one in affections, one in interests, and one in action.

Never until then will the power of Christianity be fully felt upon the world—then before the power of its might the forces of the prince of darkness will vanish like the morning mist before the fervid heat of a summer day!

“Another sign of its coming is an increasing interest felt among Christians of all denominations to understand the *reason* of the differences among their Christian brethren; and just in proportion as they become acquainted with these reasons, respect for a brother’s sincerity, at least, will break down the prejudices which now shut out their hearts from each other. Bigotry or sectarian prejudice is the child of ignorance. It is best to know both sides, or *all* sides if there are more than two, of a question. We can then form our opinions, and draw our conclusions intelligently. We then shall know *why* we believe as we do, and also why our brother differs from us, and how.”

“That reminds me,” said Elder Clayton, “that I have much prejudice against the institution of Infant Baptism in your church. It may be the result of education, for I do not know what authority you claim for it; I only know that I have often heard it said, that ‘there was not a *single precept or example* in the whole New Testament for it; and I never yet saw one there. I think I am not justified in condemning what I know so little about, and I would like to have you point me to the evidences you deem sufficient authority.”

“I will do so with the greatest pleasure,” said Halley; “the more pleasure from the conviction that you seek it with an honest desire to have the bitterness of that prejudice removed. And I trust I shall be able to convince you that it is not an institution introduced by a Roman Catholic Pope; but that it has the authority of the word of God, and is followed by the blessing of God—that it is consistent in and of itself with the nature of things—that I shall convince you of this, not for the purpose of making you conform to it, that I may be able to say there is another convert to the faith of the Presbyterian church

— or to Pedobaptism — but that you may learn to respect the claims of your Presbyterian brethren, and your Pedobaptist friends.”

“I am convinced on the start,” said Elder Clayton, “that our prejudice is too bitter. Brother Burton said that he would flee forty miles into a wilderness, rather than witness such an act of *sacrilege* as the sprinkling of an adult; and he looked with greater horror, still, upon the baptism of infants. Now if it was equally repulsive to God, would he — could he follow churches in which it is universally practised with such signal blessings and outpourings of his Spirit, which is *his seal* of acceptance, bringing sinners into the fold to have the *sacrilege repeated*? If it was a sacrilege in the eyes of God, God *could not* approve it. And if it is not a sacrilege in the eyes of God, what right and what authority have *we* for calling it by that name?”

“I have been considering the subject,” said Anna, “for a few days past; but I have found some difficulties, and I desire more information regarding it.”

“To-morrow,” said Halley, “we will commence the investigation; and if you have any friends who have objections to urge, or prejudices to remove, let them, too, be present.”

CHAPTER IX.

“How wonderful is Death,
Death and his brother Sleep!
One pale as yonder waning moon,
With lips of lurid blue;—
The other, rosy as the morn
When throned on ocean’s wave,
It blushes o’er the world;—
Yet both so passing wonderful!”

ANNA was awakened about midnight by the message, “Little Charlie is dying.” She made a hasty toilette, and descending from her chamber, found Halley at the door ready to accompany her to the house of her afflicted friend. It was a lovely hour. The full harvest moon was midway in the star-gemmed vault of heaven, looking down upon this benighted world—upon the outspread earth—as benignly as though not witnessing the agony of a thousand fluttering souls parting from their clay tenements, and as many broken and bleeding hearts gazing for the last time upon the loved objects of home circles pluming their wings for a final adieu.

When they arrived at the widow’s cottage, the little sufferer was just breathing his last. A momentary glance of recognition, and he was gone. They closed his eyes; arranged his limbs to stiffen with decorum for his long lonely grave sleep; comforted the widow—the bereaved and sorrowing one; and with the moon, watched out the night.

The morrow dawned with accustomed brightness upon the teeming world, and brought the quiet bustle of necessary preparations for laying the long-hushed sleeper in his lowly bed of earth, and also the visits of condolence from sympathizing friends.

“I do not wish him back again,” said the motherless widow; “God in great mercy has taken him from his earthly pains; but the ties of nature are broken, and I must weep.”

Anna slowly and tremulously repeated :

The God of love will sure indulge
The flowing tear, the heaving sigh,
When his own children fall around,—
Where tender friends and kindred die.”

Just as the sun was setting, a little coffin was lowered into a new-made grave, over which stood one lone mourner. The clods were thrown in, and on another mortal was passed the sentence, “Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.” Anna took the widow home with her; and again the great life surges bore them on as unceasingly as before: only a bubble had broken on the face of the deep.

The next day, a little company assembled in Elder Clayton’s study. There were not a few of the friends around, who had gathered here to listen to the controversy that was about to open; and among them, and the most prominent, was Squire Tanner, the young attorney of the town of A——, and a member of the Baptist church. He brought with him a volume, wherein was an exposition of the Baptist faith on this subject, for the purpose of refreshing his memory; and seemed to look forward with zest to the coming contest, as if expecting an easy victory.

“We are met here,” said Halley, when all were comfortably seated, “to examine the authority for infant baptism. You know it is an institution of the Pedobaptist church, and now what objections do you raise against it?”

“What we want,” said Squire Tanner, “is for you to point us to an *express* command or precept for it. You claim to get your authority from the word of God: where is it?”

“Yes,” answered Halley, “we claim that it is a divine institution, and that there *is* proof, and proof sufficient to satisfy any unbiased mind, that it was ordered of God, sanctioned by Christ, practised by the apostles, by the primitive church, by the church at all times, and in all its stages from its very first organization in the time of Abraham, down through the lapse of nearly four thousand years to the present day.”

“That is a sweeping assertion,” said Tanner with a smile of incredulity; “we do’nt require you to prove so much. Only put your finger on a plain *positive* command in the New Testament to baptize infants, and we yield the argument without further controversy.”

“But why do you demand a *positive command*?” said Halley. “The evidences to be adduced in support of infant baptism are of the same kind we have for many other institutions of the church: and I can show you the utter absurdity of demanding *positive* testimony on this subject. The testimony God has given us is inferential and circumstantial; and in our courts of justice, as you are very well aware, we inflict the most severe punishments, and decide the most important cases, on such evidence as this. We should be satisfied with *satisfactory* evidence of any kind. Moral reasoning is not like demonstrative or scientific, for it is *not* positive, but admits of all degrees from the slightest probability up to the highest degree of moral certainty.”

“Yes,” interrupted Anna, “and I know also that when the mind is wrought up, and the moral state is in a favorable frame, it only requires a small degree of evidence of the right kind to produce entire conviction; but at other times through different habits of thought, and where there are prejudices to overcome, the mind demands an unreasonable amount of proof.”

“But,” said Tanner, “everything relating to the institutions of the Church of Christ, to have any force or obligation on us, must be shown to be commanded or practised by Christ and the apostles.”

“True,” replied Halley; “all positive religious rites were originally founded on a divine command. But we are not warranted in the conclusion that such a command would be repeated to all those who shall afterward be under obligation to observe such rites, or even that the original command will be preserved and communicated to them in the Sacred Scriptures. Now neither of these can be claimed as *essential*, because sufficient proof of a divine institution can be afforded in some other way. Such is the fact with regard to many institutions of the church which are acknowledged by all evangelical Christians as divine, and harmonizing with the commands of Christ, and the customs of the church from its first organization. Has any one then a right to *prescribe the mode* of establishing a doctrine from the Bible? If we can prove the doctrine of infant baptism, in any way, from the word of God, what sense is there in the objection, which is the only one you *can* raise or urge, ‘O yes, you have proved the point, but it was not done according to the rule *we* laid down,’ and therefore, however plain and forcible it may be made, you exclaim, ‘O, I can’t believe it, because you do’nt prove it just as I said it must be proved!’”

“I do’nt believe in receiving anything but *positive* evidence regarding the institutions of Christ’s church,” said Tanner. “He set up his church himself, and instructed his disciples carefully in the nature of its laws. We would not have known that any ordinances would have been proper and acceptable to him unless they had been either enjoined or practised; so whatever is connected with them, both as regards the subjects or mode, must receive the same sanction. And I believe that to depart in the slightest respect from the manner in which they

were originally practised, changes the whole nature of the institution."

Anna smiled, for she remembered how this same argument had been handled before.

"I presume," replied Halley, "that no one claims that the Lord's Supper is administered *precisely* as it was by Christ and the apostles, and so of course you regard it as a nullity! If no institution can be binding upon Christians which is not clearly defined, and if any deviation from the original practice destroys the whole, let me ask you, Squire Tanner, why you baptize in houses, in baptismal fonts, and baptistries? Why do you demand a statement to the *church* on profession of faith, before being baptized? Where in all the New Testament is there an express command or example for these practices? You here profess to believe in limiting to *express commands*, and where are they? Point me to them, or I must declare, as an inevitable deduction from your own premises, *both* the ordinances of the Baptist church to be a *nullity*. I shall object to your drawing any conclusions from the *reason, probability, decency*, or even *necessity* of the case—you must give me something *positive!*"

"I must confess you have me there," said Tanner, hesitatingly. "Really, I had not thought of that."

"You see then that you cannot advance a single step in support of the present customs in your church," said Halley, "without making use of this privilege, and you *do* make use of it on all occasions of reasoning in defence of your own doctrines; but at the same time you are not only unwilling, but utterly refuse to grant us this privilege. But I reply, limit yourselves before you limit others. Now look at the facts in the case. The Lord's Supper was enjoined originally upon the Apostles, *men only*, and there is no express intimation in the whole New Testament of *females* having ever received the administering of the rite. Still you believe, and we believe it to

be the will of God that they should partake of it, and we admit them on the *reasonableness of the thing*, and upon the uniform practice of the early Christian churches. No one thinks of demanding an *express* command, not even a precept or example, as authority. But if we are satisfied with such evidences in this case, why not permit them to have some weight and force, I ask, in other cases? Again, there is no proof that the divine command for the observance of the Sabbath, or the offering of sacrifices, was repeated to the successive generations from Adam to Moses; or that they had *any* evidence of those divine institutions being enjoined upon them. If they had, it is not recorded in the Bible; nor is there certain proof of the repetition of the command respecting the rite of circumcision during the period from Abraham to Moses — 430 years.

“Neither in all the Bible can there be found any *express* command or precept regarding the first day of the week as the Sabbath. Through all the Sacred records, nothing definite from either Christ or the Apostles establishing or enforcing such an ordinance, can be found. Yet it is considered quite satisfactory to the Christian world, that it *is right, proper, and acceptable to God*, to observe the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath — quite satisfactory, even, to our Baptist friends. They, with us, rest their faith on the original institution of the Sabbath as enjoined in the Old Testament; and to account for the change, must claim that the original institution was especially modified at the commencement of the Christian dispensation, although the Hebrew word שַׁבָּת (*Shabbath*), nowhere indicates that such a modification *will be* made; or the Greek word σάββατον (*Sabbaton*), that one *has been* made. It is also in this very same manner that we receive many, and perhaps I might say, all of the books of the New Testament as having been given by divine inspiration. There is no *express command* recorded in the Old Testament, that the Evangelists should write such and such books and letters, and that God

would in that manner speak through them to a perishing world, and to all coming time; still we are satisfied that they are from God, and the inspired word of God, from their *internal evidences*, and from the sanction of the early Christians. It does not seem to be God's plan to give us evidences of the highest degree possible, for reasons known only to the infinite mind; probably moral reasoning and probable evidences best subserve the purposes of the moral training and discipline of his creatures. The evidences supporting many moral and religious truths are not as clear, direct, and definite, as one might naturally expect; but on the contrary, are often inferential, or a kind of intuitive moral discernment—a spontaneous operation of our faculties, or a slow result of our experience and observation; and we should be willing to take just such evidences as God is pleased to afford us, and with such to be satisfied. 'If,' says a well-known and candid writer, 'any of us should undertake to prescribe to God, or to determine beforehand what evidence we must have to satisfy our faith, and if we should reject everything which is not attended with just such evidence as we might judge suitable, we should give up some, if not all, of the most important moral truths; and should fall into a state of skepticism most fearful in its influences on our present and eternal interests.'"

"I do'n't see why we need trouble ourselves about the *kind* of evidence," said Elder Clayton, "if it is only *satisfactory*. We want to know simply what the evidences are that you claim."

"Then we might proceed directly to the consideration of the evidences," said Halley, "if you have no prejudices or objections against the nature of the institution. But I believe that you have, and it probably will be better to consider them first."

"There is," said Tanner, "one very important objection, and to me altogether conclusive. The word of God points out very plainly and definitely what are the necessary qualifications

in a subject for baptism; and in view of these prerequisites, infants are not proper subjects."

"If that be true," responded Halley, "it settles the matter at once; but what are the necessary qualifications pointed out by the word of God?"

"Faith in Christ is necessary," replied Tanner. "In the commission as given by Mark, its terms are: 'He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved.' Here faith is a prerequisite; and further, none but adult believers were baptized by John and the disciples of Christ."

"I will take up your last objection first, and reply that *we too* believe in adult baptism. No one, who has arrived at the age when it is possible to exercise faith, ought to be baptized unless he is a believer. Therefore every one not baptized in infancy in this Christian country, and every one converted to Christianity from the Jews or among heathen nations, is required to give a satisfactory account of his faith before being admitted to baptism. When therefore we are referred to instances of adult baptism recorded in the New Testament as a proof of the correctness of Baptist faith, and of the impropriety of ours, it proves nothing at all in the present controversy. It is our practice, where the circumstances demand it, as much as yours, to baptize adult believers. The primitive Christians were not, as a matter of impossibility, baptized in their infancy, because the ordinance, as a Christian ordinance, was not then instituted; and therefore if baptized at all, it must be when adults.

"The case of the heathen at the present day is the only parallel case; and our missionaries baptize adults, when they are converted to the Christian faith, in the same manner as the disciples of Christ baptized the first believers in their time. There is no controversy here, and the only question between us, is whether infants of Christian parents are not *also* entitled to the same privilege. And now as to the objection you urge—

it is, I believe, that infants are not capable of believing, and therefore are not proper subjects."

"Yes," said Tanner, "'He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved.' They can't believe, and therefore should not be baptized! This is what I call a perfect demonstration."

"And I will make another from the same text," said Halley. "'He that *believeth not* shall be damned.' Infants cannot believe, and therefore must be damned! I call that *another* perfect demonstration. Your reasoning will exclude all infants from salvation, for it asserts just as positively, that he that *believeth not* shall be damned, as, that he that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved. If this refers to infants at all, so as to cut them off from baptism, then it also cuts them off from salvation. We are, therefore, compelled, in order to avoid the horrid and repulsive doctrine of infant damnation, to claim that the passage has no reference, at all, to any but those who are capable of exercising faith—it must refer to adults only."

"I think you will have to give up that passage, Squire Tanner," said Elder Clayton, "for it proves too much."

"I am of the opinion that I can use it yet," said Tanner, consulting his text-book. "Believing stands before baptism, and therefore we must believe before we are baptized. The Bible says, believe and be baptized, but infants cannot believe; the Bible says, repent and be baptized, but infants cannot repent, and therefore should not be baptized."

"Let us look at that a moment," said Halley; "there are three things mentioned there; (1) believing, (2) baptizing, and (3) being saved. Now, you say that the second (baptizing), ought not to come before the first (believing); very well, then, I will add, that *surely* the third (being saved), ought not to come before the first; and consequently infants cannot be saved because they cannot believe! If then there is any force in your reasoning, if it is proper—if your premises are true—the inference is inevitable, that infants cannot be saved because

they cannot believe. But you dare not admit this conclusion, which follows directly from your position taken, because forsooth it proves too much! And however anxious you may be to keep infants from the jurisdiction of the church, I cannot suppose you would try to keep them, also, out of heaven."

"The thought has occurred to me," said Anna, "that the largest proportion of the redeemed ones in heaven are infant souls."

"Yes, it has been estimated," continued Halley, "that one-half of all that are born, die within three years. Then how many untold millions, and millions of millions, are there of infant souls in heaven to-day? Is it to be wondered at, that Jesus said, 'Of such is the kingdom of God'? If the term 'kingdom of God' means the church on earth, as your text-book asserts," he said, nodding toward Tanner, who was turning over the leaves in search of the next argument, "then it follows that infants have a certain relation to the visible church; but if it means the church above — the church triumphant — the idea is that this church is composed in a great measure of those who die in infancy. In either case there is reason and propriety in consecrating them to God in the ordinance of baptism; thus laying them upon his altar, *for how can we deny them the seal, when Christ has declared them entitled to the thing sealed?* You, as well as we, believe it to be a part of the plan of redemption to apply the atonement and the influences of the Spirit to every infant, thereby making it meet for heaven, opening a way for it into that world which was shut against it by the first transgression; so we need not argue that point. But further than this, we claim, that as baptism typifies this operation of the Spirit, and as every infant in its unconscious state is as fit a subject for the operation of the Spirit's influences as a repenting believing adult, that therefore they are equally entitled to the outward seal. If I ask you, Elder Clayton, what it is that makes a person a fit subject for baptism, you being a

Baptist, would probably reply, repentance and faith on the Lord Jesus Christ. But why need infants repent? They have never rebelled, they have never transgressed the commands of God. Our blessed Savior wiped out all original sin with his own precious blood, and we are to be judged and condemned only for our own actual transgressions. But infants have never committed an actual transgression, they have never rebelled, consequently God regards them in the same light, as though they had been actual rebels who had become repentant, and to whom the blood of cleansing has been applied — that is, the same in effect.

“The blood of cleansing is applied to both — the infant and the actual transgressor — in one case wiping out inherited sin only, and in the other, both inherited and actual sin. But are they not both in the same relation to God? Both are justified by the blood of Jesus. Faith is not required of infants, because they cannot exercise it, and are saved without it. Now look at it. Your infant stands in the same relation to God and the atonement, that you do, if you are a Christian. If it dies, it will just as surely be carried by angels to Abraham’s bosom, as will the dying saint. Then the infant is as truly a member of Christ’s invisible church, as its praying father or penitent mother; and I ask by whose authority do you shut it out from the privileges, advantages and blessings, of Christ’s visible church? When you present yourself for admission, the only claim you urge, or can urge, is that you have already been admitted by Christ into his spiritual or invisible church; you need no other claim, you may then demand admission as a *right*, for the visible church was instituted for the purpose of gathering into its folds all those, and those only, whom Christ had received and justified; but your infant is beforehand with you. You have been a rebel for years, and defied the authority of God over you; you can only enter by forsaking your rebellious ways, and after making humble confessions, by returning again

to your allegiance. Then Christ admits you at once into his spiritual fold, but your infant has been there ever since it was born; and there it will remain until by *actual transgression* it becomes a rebel like yourself before repentance. Now if your infant is a member of Christ's *invisible* church, it has the same claim for admission to the *visible* that you have—the *only* claim that can be urged, justification through the blood of Jesus—and by whose authority do you, then, dare to exclude it? It is your imperative duty to see that it is thus consecrated to God, and admitted to the pale and privileges of the church of Christ."

"But still," said Elder Clayton, "there seems to be some difference after all, for if the child lives it almost invariably grows up a rebel to God, and perhaps will not only live, but die a rebel."

"But this would not be the case if children were early consecrated, and parents were faithful, and discharged the duties incumbent upon them *as* parents—as their temporal and spiritual guardians. And, further, a large fraction of those admitted, on confession of their faith, to the pale of the church—the visible church—betray their Master and wander back again into the world; and many who retain their church connection will reap by it a deeper condemnation; but who, I ask, but the scoffing infidel, thinks of presenting this as an argument to prove that no one should be received, and that as a consequence there should be no church? But let us go back to your objections. What have you further to urge?"

"There is one on the 280th page (THEODOSIA ERNEST, vol. i.)," said Tanner; "and as it is probably presented better than I could do it myself, I will read it. It runs: 'It is forbidden in the commission itself. The command to baptize *believers* is a command *not to baptize* any but believers. The command to make disciples *first* and then baptize them, is a command *not to baptize* any who are not first made disciples.' What do you say to that?"

“I reply,” said Halley, “that Mark xvi. 16, ‘He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;’ and also Matthew xxviii. 19, ‘Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father,’ etc., have no reference to any persons but those who are capable of believing, and of being taught. It is just such a direction that we would give to a missionary going out to a heathen nation, or to the Jews at the present day; and he would consider it as forbidding him to baptize any adult persons only, who had not first been taught the principles of Christianity. It has no more reference to children than the direction of the apostle Paul, in 2 Thess. iii. 10: ‘If any will not work, neither shall he eat.’ He must here refer to those *only* who are capable of working, for Paul was never so inconsistent, so hard-hearted, as to assert that children (infants), the sick, and the aged, who could not work, should not eat. But according to your reasoning, with regard to the commission for baptism, he entirely and absolutely cuts off all those who are not capable of working, from eating! Also when Paul addresses Timothy thus, in 2 Tim. iv. 13, ‘The cloak that I left in Troas, with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee; and the book, but especially the parchment,’ he thereby utterly forbids him from bringing anything else whatever. Will you admit this deduction also? It is a natural and unavoidable inference from your mode of reasoning, but its fallacy and absurdity, after a little reflection, must be apparent to all. And further, I may add, that if repentance and faith are necessary prerequisites to baptism, then our Savior ought not to have been baptized, for he was without sin, and therefore could not repent; nor could he know faith in that sense in which it is required of us. Here is a parallel case as far as qualifications for baptism are concerned. Jesus Christ never committed an *actual sin*, but the sin of the whole world was imputed to him. An infant has never committed an *actual sin*, but the sin of the first man, Adam, is imputed to it. There was no exercise of faith in the

mind of Jesus Christ, because from the nature of the case it was clearly impossible. So also there is no exercise of faith in the mind of the child, because from the nature of the case it is impossible. Yet Jesus Christ was baptized, and if that was *right*, it follows that the argument of our Baptist friends is wrong. Now let us follow up your style of reasoning a little further.

“Turn to Rom. ii. 25; Paul says, ‘For circumcision verily profiteth if thou keep the law;’ but you would say, an infant cannot keep the law, and therefore an infant’s circumcision cannot profit it—it is a mere nullity. But read the other half of the verse, ‘If thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision.’ Now apply your reasoning again, and the deduction follows—but an infant cannot be a breaker of the law, therefore its circumcision cannot be made uncircumcision, that is, it cannot become a nullity. Do’nt you see that your method of reasoning proves things as absurd as that circumcision is of *great* importance, and of *no* importance, and that, too, from the same passage of Scripture! Would it not be much more reasonable to conclude that Paul’s remarks applied to those only who were capable of keeping or breaking the law? Any other conclusion involves an absurdity. Turn also to Gal. v. 3, where Paul says, ‘I testify unto every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the *whole law*.’ Now you reason of baptism, that whoever is baptized is a debtor to do the law of Christ, as Paul said of circumcision—the obligations are equal. Suppose the Jews to have replied to Paul, if every one who is circumcised is a debtor to the whole law, what is the use of having our little children circumcised? they do’nt know anything about the act itself, nor can they understand one of the obligations it imposes on them. It must be not only useless, but wicked, even sacrilegious, in the sight of God! Would not Paul have replied, If they cannot keep it, neither can they *break* it, hence are they justified before God; see thou to it,

that thou keepest thyself as pure as the child. From this view of the matter we may learn that Paul's directions, although specifying the obligations imposed by the rite of circumcision, did not cut off those who could not understand those obligations; and no more do the directions regarding the obligations imposed by the rite of baptism, cut off those who cannot understand those obligations. Infants were circumcised by the command of God, and if by the command of God it *must have been right*, and if it was right, then is the argument of our Baptist friends *wrong*; namely, that because infants cannot repent and believe, therefore they should not be baptized. What becomes of your assertion, then, that infant baptism is positively forbidden by the commission itself? Can you find any more passages which positively forbid it?"

"But if we grant that this *is* false reasoning," said Tanner, "as I am inclined to believe it is, even then you have very much to do. That it was not prohibited does not prove that it was enforced."

"True," replied Halley, "but that it is not prohibited is very good ground to start upon. Now it may be well to inquire on how many separate principles God has administered his kingdom in this world. The covenant with Adam, when placed in Eden, was one of WORKS. God said, *Do* thus and so and you are justified, thus and so and you are condemned. The next with Abraham was one of GRACE, through a mediator; has there been any more? Do *we* rest our hope on the Covenant of Grace?"

"Yes," replied Anna—

"Grace all the work shall crown
Through everlasting days."

"These, then, are all," continued Halley. "The first covenant ceased with the fall of Adam. When it was broken, all men were fallen under condemnation; and yet God in his infinite

mercy, whilst pronouncing sentence on the human race, gave a beam of hope to lighten the darkness of despair by intimating to Adam the forming of a *new covenant*, to be an everlasting covenant, wherein should be involved the work of Grace through a Mediator and the shedding of blood. Abel's sacrifice, bleeding upon the altar, looked forward to this *new covenant* to be founded on Grace, and was accepted: whereas Cain's looked backward to the old covenant of works, and was therefore rejected. Now *all* of Adam's posterity, who have at any time come into friendship and covenant with God, have effected this through Grace in a Mediator. Do you concede this point, Squire Tanner?"

"I do not know how it can consistently be denied," responded the Squire.

"There is none other name given under heaven among men whereby we can be saved," repeated Anna. "The word of God answers your question: for there is no other way to save a soul but through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ."

"Then it is conceded," continued Halley, "that since the fall of our first parents, God has dealt with his people only on the principle of Grace. The church then is built on this principle, was built upon it *at the first*, and is still built on it. And if the Church was *first* established on the principle of Grace, and is still abiding on it, is it not the *same Church* and the *only Church* which God has established in the world? God has never established but *one Church*; for *only one could* be built on the same foundation (grace), having Christ as the chief corner-stone. When then did God first establish a church in the world? What is a church? When we join a church, God covenants with us, and we covenant with God; and when did God thus covenant with the faithful of a fallen world? You will find an account of it in Gen. xvii. 7, God says: 'I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations for an *everlasting covenant*, to be a

God unto thee and to thy seed after thee.' Here are all the parts and parties of a covenant. God is one of the parties, and the believer and his seed the other party. Here God covenants on the one part to be a God to the believer and to his seed, and on the other part the believer and his seed must keep the covenant and must receive the token or seal of the covenant. Here is a formal establishment of an everlasting church in the family of Abraham; for God declares the covenant everlasting, and the Church must exist as long as the covenant. God covenanted with Abraham, and Abraham covenanted with God. Just so God covenants with us now, and we covenant with God when we enter his Church. The token or seal of this covenant is recorded in Gen. xvii. 11, 'And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin and it shall be a token of the covenant between me and thee.' Now what were the peculiarities of this covenant which God established with this Church? We notice first, that children were here included in the same covenant with the believing parent, and did receive the same token or seal of the covenant which the believing parent received. This you do not pretend to deny?"

"Why no," responded Tanner, "we do'nt deny that it was so under the old Jewish dispensation."

"Well, then, secondly," resumed Halley, "circumcision, which was appointed to be a token or seal of this covenant, was a religious ordinance. Was the keeping of the Passover and the sprinkling of blood on that night of death in Egypt a religious ordinance? If it was not, then we might question whether there ever had been a religious ordinance in the world to the people of God. But if it was one, then what made it so? Manifestly because God had appointed it to be a sign of the covenant between him and his visible covenant people. And in the same manner that which makes circumcision a religious ordinance, is because God appointed it to be a sign, token, or seal of the covenant between him and his people. In its very meaning as a sign, it was a religious institution."

“But what did it point to, as a sign,” asked Elder Clayton.

“Unquestionably,” replied Halley, “to the work of God’s Spirit and Grace on the heart. And it was from this very fact called ‘a sign of circumcision’—that is, a sign of the circumcision of the heart. What is the Scripture evidence on this point? ‘And the Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live,’ Deut. xxx. 6. Also in Rom. ii. 29, ‘Circumcision is that of the heart in the Spirit, and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men but of God.’ As a sign, then, this religious rite pointed to the circumcision of the heart, the regeneration of the heart, the purifying or cleansing of the heart, that the heart thus purified by the Spirit of God through the mediation and blood of Christ, might keep the covenant of God; might love and worship God in spirit and in truth.

“This is what the covenant with Abraham required, and this is what God now requires through the Gospel of his Son. But as a seal, how are we to regard this rite? Is it not to be regarded as pointing to the righteousness of faith—that righteousness of faith in which we believe, and through which we become justified? Paul says of Abraham, ‘He received the sign of circumcision as a seal of the righteousness of the faith he had being yet uncircumcised,’—faith in the coming Messiah and the great sacrifice and atonement to be made for the ransom of a lost world. Thus it points to the righteousness of Christ as sealing the compact on the part of God, and it points also to the faith by which the believer lays hold on the promises of God, and this offer he makes to fallen man. God proposes to enter into covenant with man to be his God and the God of his seed, and requires man, if he assents, to be circumcised, both he and his seed: and when man thus assents and complies, the *act visibly seals the covenant*.

“From this, three things are proved relating to the Church

which God then established: (1.) God included the child of the believer in the same covenant with the believing parent. God said, 'Between me and thee and thy seed after thee.' (2.) God made to them the same promise as to their believing parent: 'I will be a God to thee and thy seed after thee.' (3.) God required the same outward visible token and seal of the covenant established between him and his visible, believing people, to be applied to the believing parent and to his child: and this rite was the one by which *all believers* were to be admitted to the visible Church of God. Now who has changed this plan of God? What other formal organization of a church is found in the records of the Bible?"

"O, that was the old Jewish church," said Tanner. "When Christ came, he set up a Gospel church."

"Ah! did he? in what respect does the Gospel church differ from the old Jewish church? Were its principles changed? Perhaps if you would turn to the account of its *reorganization*, you could point out the difference."

"Its reorganization?" repeated Tanner, slowly; "where is that?"

"I do not know," replied Halley; "but so important a matter as a reorganization of God's church *ought* to be recorded. I have, it is true, never been able to find it; but perhaps you can, or at least state the point of difference."

"O yes, certainly; the Jewish church was made up of a numberless amount of forms and ceremonies, all of which are done away. The terms of membership are also changed: then the whole Jewish nation were members, but now those only who exercise faith on the Lord Jesus Christ."

"I have one objection to make to your theory of a reorganization of the church," said Halley, "God promised Abraham that the church he established with him should be *everlasting*, and God says, he can *not lie*, and Abraham evidently believed it would be just as God said. We also read that God is un

changeable, the same from eternity to eternity; in view of which, the idea of his changing his mind on this or any other matter — if such a term may be applied to an immutable God who is a Spirit — involves a contradiction wholly at variance with the whole character of God. But granting that he *could* change, one might expect, in view of the covenant — ay, with Abraham might demand, a *reason why*; and such a record we should have in his word — in his revealed will.”

“Why, the reason for it is given,” said Tanner. “The Jews rejected their Messiah — the stone which was the head of the corner, they, the builders rejected, and Christ declared, ‘Therefore say I unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken away from you and given unto a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.’”

“But that is a *transfer* merely, with no changes implied in that which is thus transferred. Nothing is added to it or taken from it. It is merely taking from one and giving to another. You must find something very different from that whereon to establish a reorganization of the church. Point us to the record of the time when the old church ceased to exist, and a new one was established. Let us all take this matter in hand, and search for scriptural evidences of a new church.”

Squire Tanner evidently felt himself in an unpleasant position, and was industriously searching his text-book in hope of finding something to remove the difficulty. After a little, looking up with an air of triumph, he said; “Here on page 292, is something to the point. ‘This church (the gospel church) God set up for the *first* time when John began to preach. For the first time he organized a visible assembly of penitent, believing, holy persons. There were good men, pious devoted men and women among the Jews; but they were not gathered into a *church*. The Jewish nation had some religious privileges; but it was not in the Gospel sense a *church*.’”

“That’s it,” said Halley, “that’s what we are looking after.

I was sure our Baptist friends could point to the organization of a *new* church, with the time and place specified. Squire Tanner, will you now take the New Testament and read to us the account given there of its organization under the supervision of John? We should like to compare the two statements."

Tanner took the Bible, and glanced over the record as given by the Evangelists, and said; "Why you know John the Baptist preached repentance and faith in the Messiah who was to come after him; and he baptized those whom he considered repentant. That is unquestionably a peculiarity of the gospel church."

"Is it!" responded Halley. "Let us examine the subject a moment, and see if to preach repentance and faith in the coming Messiah, was a peculiarity of *that church John came to set up!* What messenger from God did not preach repentance? Isaiah preached it; he said, 'Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow.' What Gospel minister could preach better repentance than that? Jeremiah preached it; he said, 'Go and proclaim these words toward the north, saying, Return, thou backsliding Israel, saith the Lord, and I will not cause mine anger to fall upon you, for I am merciful, saith the Lord. Only acknowledge thine iniquity, that thou hast transgressed against the Lord thy God.' Ezekiel preached it; for he said, 'Thus saith the Lord God, Repent and turn yourselves from your idols, and turn away your faces from all your abominations.' Hosea preached it; for he said, 'O Israel, return unto the Lord thy God, for thou hast fallen by thy iniquity.' Joel preached it; for he said, 'Therefore, saith the Lord, Turn ye even unto me with all your heart, and with fasting, and with weeping, and with mourning, and rend your hearts and not your garments.' Is not that Gospel repentance?"

“And is not that the very same church, which some allege to have been first set up in the time of John, that existed in the time of Abraham?” asked Anna; “for Paul says in Gal. iii. 8-9; “And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached *before* the *Gospel* unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith, are blessed with faithful Abraham.”

“Yes,” continued Halley, “the very same; and so was the preaching then the same as that since; repentance and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. The only difference is, they looked forward to his coming, and we backward to that event. Repentance was the burden of *all* God’s messengers; and John preached it, simply because he was one of the number. But can you suppose that they imagined they were setting up a *new church* every time they said ‘repent’? They also preached the Messiah that was to come after them; every one of them preached the Messiah as the hope and salvation of Israel. And as for John’s *baptism*, he performed no new act; it was but the ceremonial purification of the Jews. It was always practised when any one was converted from paganism — or gentile nation — to the true religion. This fact is established on the testimony of many of the most learned and accredited of the Jewish writers. They unanimously assert, that from the time of Moses, it had always been customary when proselytes were made, for them to be circumcised, to be baptized, and to offer an oblation. To establish this also, we have the unanimous testimony of all the Rabbins, as well as the universality of the practice among the Jews of the 2d century, when many of the learned Jews wrote.

“The testimony of Maimonides, who lived in the 12th century, is very satisfactory on this subject. He says; ‘Israel was admitted into covenant by three things; namely, by circumcision, baptism and sacrifice. Baptism was in the wilderness *before the giving of the law.*’ Again, ‘Abundance of proselytes were made in the days of David and Solomon before

private men, and the great sanhedrim was full of care about this business; for they would not cast them out of the *church* because they were *baptized*.'

"Issure Biah wrote, 'Whensoever any heathen, etc. will take the yoke of the law upon him, circumcision, *baptism*, and a voluntary oblation are required. That was a common axiom, no man is a proselyte until he be circumcised and *baptized*.'

"The Babylonish Talmud was compiled by the Babylonish Jews during the 5th, 6th, and 7th centuries. The writers mentioned therein, lived prior to that time—some of them many years—if not several centuries before. Rabbi Simī, the son of Chaia, says: 'Proselytes do not enter into covenant except by these three things, circumcision, *baptism*, and peace-offering.'

"Rabbi Jochanan: 'Never shall any one be deemed a proselyte, until he is *baptized* as well as circumcised; for before he is *baptized*, he is regarded as a foreigner.'

"Rabbi Joseph states: 'If any one comes, saying, I am circumcised, but not *baptized*, let them see that he is *baptized*.'

"Rabbi Judah says: 'Baptism is the principal thing.' All these are found in the Babylonish Talmud, and much more to the same effect. The same evidence is found in the Jerusalem Talmud, which was compiled in the *third* century; only one witness will I cite from it.

"Rabbi Eliezer, the son of Jacob, says: 'That some Roman soldiers, who kept guard at Jerusalem, ate of the passover, *being baptized on the evening of the passover*.'

"Nor does the evidence of this fact rest solely on the testimony of Jewish records; it was known to the heathen nations around them. Says Epictetus, who lived about the year A. D. 104, and who was sixty years old when he penned this passage which we quote, 'Why,' said he, in reproving those who professed to be philosophers while they did not live as such; 'why do you pretend to be a Greek, when you are a Jew, a Syrian, an Egyptian? And when we see any one wavering, we

are wont to say, this is not a Jew but acts one. But when he assumes the sentiments of one who hath been *baptized* and *circumcised*, then he both really is, and is called a Jew.' In Calmet's Dictionary, art. Pros., we find this passage: "The Jews require three things to a complete proselyte — baptism, circumcision, and sacrifice; but for women, only baptism and sacrifice.'

"Says Dr. Wall, 'Whenever Gentiles were proselyted to the Jewish religion, they were initiated by circumcision, the offering of a sacrifice, and baptism. They were all *baptized*, males and females, adults and infants. This was their constant practice from the time of Moses to that of our Savior, and from that period to the present day.'

"Those who wish for further testimony will find it by consulting Stackhouse, Witsius, Dr. A. Clarke, Lightfoot, Jahn's *Archæology*, etc. etc.

"Even Mr. Booth, a distinguished Baptist writer, admits of Jewish converts, that 'The children of proselytes were baptized along with their parents.' R. Robinson and Dr. Gill also admit it.

"Moreover this seems to be a plain inference from the Scriptures—that is, that the Jews must have been accustomed to the rite of baptism, and expected the Messiah, when he came, to practise it; or else how can we account for their propounding to John the question, 'Why baptizeth thou, then, if thou be not the Christ?'

"From this, then, we learn that the baptism of proselytes by John, and by the disciples of our Savior, was no *new thing*. But Jewish baptism, it is true, was not Christian baptism; neither was the baptism of John Christian baptism; else why were his proselytes baptized over again when they became proselytes to the Christian faith, and believed that Jesus was the Son of God? See Acts xix. 3-5.

"I am aware that many of our Baptist brethren find it necessary to *insist* that there was no re-baptism, as that truth

spoils their argument: but I only wonder that a cause which requires so plain a statement of Scripture to be denied, should be thought worth defending. The word of God says, 'Unto what were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him who should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. *When they heard this they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.* And when Paul had laid his hands on them, the Holy Ghost came on them.' Mr. Carson, an eminent Baptist author, admits, p. 372, that in Acts xix. 1-6, some who had been baptized with John's baptism were baptized over again: 'I know this is disputed,' says he, 'but for my part I never doubted it. I cannot see how this can be denied without torturing the word of God.'

"Now the reasons for this re-baptism to me are evident from the nature of the case. (1.) John baptized none but Jews — his mission was to call the Jews to repentance; and he was laboring under the ceremonial law, therefore his baptism could not be the *seal* of any covenant at all; and we cannot reason from a form that is not a seal, to one that is. (2.) It was impossible for it to have been Christian baptism, for the commission was not yet given, nor was the Lord Jehovah revealed to man as a *Triune* God in the persons of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. See Acts xix. 2, John's disciples said, 'We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.' If they had been baptized in the name of the Holy Ghost, would it have been possible for them to declare that they had not so much as heard that there be a Holy Ghost? Nor were they baptized by John in the name of the Lord Jesus, because Paul was about to have this done to them. Now, let me ask you, if a simple dipping or sprinkling would be Christian baptism now, unless it be done in the name of the *Triune* God? And if it would not be now, how could it have been then? Therefore,

in order that they should be partakers of Christian baptism, it was necessary that they should be baptized in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost."

Tanner turned again to his text-book and said, "But Christ called the Jewish nation the world in opposition to his church. Christ says, I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world, that is, the Jewish nation, hateth you. Paul said he was a persecutor of the church of God before he was converted. And Nicodemus, who was a master in Israel, was told by Christ that he could not come into his church until he had been born again. So you see, Mr. Halley, that there was *no church* before that church was established which Christ came to set up."

"You say," said Halley, in reply, "as I understand you, that the Jewish nation could not have been a church, for Christ chose his disciples out of the world. But this expression of our Savior only shows the spiritless condition into which the Jews had relapsed on account of their blind and superstitious attachment to forms. Christ's disciples were not like them actuated by the spirit of the world, but by the love of God and holiness. And Christ, by choosing them to be his followers, separated them in a particular manner from their former associates; and placed them *really*, not nominally only, under the government of his holy laws. No sensible man will claim that he who *now* belongs to a Christian church, and by his actions and life shows that he has apostatized from the faith—leading an ungodly life—no one will claim that such an one is a *true* member of the church of Christ; nor would he be so called by the 'Searcher of hearts.' So it was in respect to the Jews in the time of Christ, they were but *nominally* the church of God, that is, the great body of them, the majority; they were, it is true, his chosen people, but they had become spiritually dead, and the kingdom was about to be taken away from them and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. Paul, after his conversion, found that he had been fighting against God's

spiritual ones who were then truly the church of God, for the kingdom had then indeed been taken away from the Jews.

“Your third objection regarding Nicodemus, is nothing to the point at all. Christ could not have referred to the visible church, by the term ‘kingdom of God,’ where he says, ‘Ye must be born again to enter into the kingdom of God,’ for that involves the absurdity that no one could join the visible church unless *really* converted and regenerated by the influences of the Holy Spirit, which we all know to be false, and the Omniscient Savior certainly knew it to be so. There are thousands in the church to-day, who have entered it on confession of their faith, who were never born of the Spirit. Our Savior then meant, ye must be born again to enter his spiritual kingdom or church. In that fold there is not *one* soul that has not been born of the Spirit.

“Have you any more texts, Squire Tanner, to prove that there was no church before the church John set up? If you have not, we will see what evidence we can find to prove that there *was* a church before the ministry of Christ or of John.”

“Did not Stephen say that there was of old, in existence, a church?” asked Anna. “Here it is in Acts vii. 38. I will read it: ‘This is he that was in the *church* in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in Mount Sinai, and with our fathers who received the lively oracles to give unto us.’”

“Yes,” replied Halley; “Stephen, being full of the Holy Ghost, was giving them a history of this church; and he traced its origin back to the family of Abraham, and claimed that Jesus came by promise to this church. Hear him: ‘This is that Moses that said unto the children of Israel, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear. This is he (Christ) that was in the *church* in the wilderness, etc.’ Squire Tanner, you like *positive* testimony, and here is some to order. Now we claim that this ‘church in the wilderness,’ of which Stephen was

speaking, whose father was Abraham — whose founder, God — and the Christian church, are *one and the same church*; that the Christian church is but the continuation of the Jewish church from the facts: (1.) No account is given anywhere in the whole word of God of the organization of a *new one*. (2.) The great principles of the Old and New Testament church are the same — built on Grace with Christ as the head — the same doctrines, the same spiritual requirements, in short, the same way of salvation. (3.) Many promises were made to the Jewish church which were not fulfilled till after the coming of Christ; but have since been fulfilled in whole or in part, to the Christian church. See the 35th, 43d, and 53d chapters of Isaiah, and others — all of which are promises fulfilled to the Christian church; and over and above all this, there is an abundance of testimony to establish this fact. You have quoted Matt. xxi. 43, where our Savior declares that the kingdom of God shall be taken away from the Jews, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. To deny that the Jewish people were ever the church of God, is to give the lie to the Son of God, for this is *positive* testimony. If they were never in possession of the kingdom or church of God, how could it be taken from them? If we — if the Christian world are in possession of anything to-day, that is conferred on us by the Gospel of Jesus Christ, that is what was taken away from the Jews and given to us?

“Now what was entrusted to the keeping of the Jewish church? Let Paul answer in Rom. iii. 2, ‘Unto them were committed the oracles of God.’ They are now committed unto us. Again in Romans ix. 4, ‘To whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promise.’ Can we put forth better claims than these? Turn also to Romans xi. 23–24, and you will find the same truth taught. The idea is expressed in a metaphor. The visible church is represented as

an OLIVE-TREE, of which the Jews were the natural branches, but broken off on account of unbelief; and the Gentiles, who had been hitherto wild by nature, *were to be grafted in their stead*. No new creation here, or reorganization — mark the fact, — the trunk of the tree, which represents the church proper, is not uprooted — not cut down. The church is the same with its covenants and privileges; but its branches or members were lopped off, and others grafted into the same covenant and privileges in their stead. Said Paul, ‘And they also (that is, those who were broken off — the Jews as a nation), if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in again; for God is able to graft them in again. For if thou wert cut out of the olive-tree, which is wild by nature, and wert grafted in contrary to nature, into a *good olive-tree*, how much more shall they, which are the natural branches, be grafted into their *OWN olive-tree!*’ Tell me, Elder Clayton, and you who are familiar with the process of engrafting, is the trunk torn up, and the roots exhumed and thrown away, when the scion is grafted in among the natural branches, and with them partakes of its *root and fatness?* Said Paul, ‘Boast not against the branches, but if thou boast, *thou bearest not the root, but the root thee.*’

“Now, is it not here asserted most *positively*, that the old trunk — the Abrahamic church — is not thrown aside; but rather that the Christian church draws its support from the original and still living root — *the covenant of promise* — that *everlasting* covenant made with the father of the faithful, upon which was founded the *first* church ever organized, the *only* church ever organized, and where now rests, and has ever rested, and will ever abide, the *only* church now extant, whose founder and builder is God? It is this which secures to us Christ, which secures to us all the mercy and blessings God has ever covenanted to bestow. The voice of God pealing as from Mount Sinai, with tones as distinct as those which shall call the world to judgment, could not make this matter more plain!

“The word of God plainly declares that there never was a time when one church ceased to exist, and another one commenced an existence. Can it be, then, that the children of the Gentile believer, who is ingrafted into the same church, and with some of its old members, shares the privileges of its root—its covenant and promise—can it be that they (these children of promise) are *excluded* from all these advantages, without one word having been said to that effect? Is there now to believers no covenant embracing their children, no token or seal of that covenant of God with them, to be applied to their children? Could anything short of an edict from Jehovah himself, cut off one of the parties of that covenant, and declare them not entitled to its privileges? We acknowledge no other authority, we DARE not recognize any other; but if you will point us to the ‘THUS SAITH THE LORD’ for your position and your faith, then we will bow reverently, and obey. But so far from your being able to do that, we have the ‘THUS SAITH THE LORD’ all on our side, perpetuating and *eternizing* these blessings and privileges to the children of the believer through his *everlasting* covenant and promise.

“If you could prove, Squire Tanner, that children are excluded from the care and privileges of the church of God, as you are trying to do, there would be a higher wall of partition between the Gentile and Jewish nation—or church if you prefer that term—than ever existed under the old dispensation. But Paul says in Eph. ii. 14, that Christ broke down the middle wall of partition which separated the Jews and Gentiles; ‘For he is our peace who hath *made both one*, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us.’ This was very forcible, coming as it did from a Jew, and addressed to the Gentiles, and what do you suppose they understood by it? What could they understand by it, but that Christ had made both Jews and Gentiles one church—one people. He removed the wall of partition, and the Gentiles were brought in and made

one with its members. The Gentile believers were added to the Jewish believers, the branches not broken off, because there were many Jews who believed on Jesus Christ, or the language of the Apostle is the merest nonsense!"

Tanner opened his text-book (THEODOSIA ERNEST, vol. i.), page 291, and read: "The truth is simply this; God made a covenant or agreement with Abraham, when he was ninety-nine years old, in which he promised to his seed the land of Canaan. The token or memento of this contract, was the circumcision of every male. This was the condition of their entering Canaan. This is *now* the condition of their restoration to it. The promise still stands. The Jews are still a separate people. This is their *mark*. By this they are yet to claim their inheritance. This is their object, and this the *sum of its value*."

"Then I must reply," said Halley, "that God is not a covenant-keeping God; for through their whole history the Jews have *rigidly*, even *superstitiously*, adhered to the rite of circumcision, so that there has been no failure on their part in this contract, if your author has stated it truly. Why then, I ask, are they not in possession of the land of Canaan to-day? Why have they not ever been in permanent possession of it?"

"Why have they been turned out of that land again and again for this, that, and the other reason, if God, as you affirm, covenanted to give it to them for an inheritance, if they would simply perform *this act*—the act of circumcision? Can you tell me? Is that the way God deals with man—with his intelligent creatures? Such violations of covenanted and plighted promises would disgrace the most absolute tyranny on earth! Is this the character of that God whom the Baptists worship? What an object for Jehovah to enter into covenant with a nation, requiring them to wear a *national badge*, for fear He, the Searcher of hearts and the discernor of our most secret thoughts, might not know them; and as a compensation promises them a spot of earth for a dwelling-place! Is not this an

impeachment of the character of God? What saith the Scriptures? 'Circumcision is that of the HEART *in the SPIRIT* and NOT in the letter,' or outward act. How does that harmonize with your author's assertion of its nature—of its complete *sum and value* as a mere *national badge*?

"If he had been a Jew he would have been of that class who make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments, thinking that thereby they meet the requirements of God; for he seems to have the greatest difficulty in perceiving the spiritual import of anything. He directly contradicts the testimony of Paul, for Paul says, 'Circumcision is a seal of the righteousness of faith;' but your author, Mr. Graves, says, 'No, Paul, you are mistaken; that ~~is~~ isn't true; circumcision is merely the seal of a *worldly inheritance!*' But says Paul again, Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, who were heirs with him of the same promise, when commanded to go out into a place which they should receive for an inheritance, went, not knowing whither, and *by faith* sojourned in the land of promise, looking for a city whose builder and maker is God. 'These all died *in faith, not having received* the promises (although they dwelt in the promised land—in the land of Canaan), but confessed that they were *strangers and pilgrims on the earth*. For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. But now they desire a better country, that is, a heavenly; wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city.' And further, do'nt you remember how God covenanted '*to be their God,*' and now he 'is not ashamed to be called their God,' for by the *eye of faith* they discerned the land of promise, even the *heavenly*, and that 'city which hath foundations whose builder and maker is God.'

"But our brother Baptist replies, Why you are altogether mistaken, Paul! It is *absolutely necessary* that we differ from you on that subject, for that promise and covenant had nothing to do with that better country, that is, a *heavenly*,' nor with that

Jerusalem which is above, 'whose builder and maker is God;' it was only the land of Canaan they were talking and covenanting about. God told Abraham if he would go and sojourn in that strange land he would give it to him, and to his seed after him, IF he would circumcise every male child. It was a sort of legal contract by which he and his heirs were to claim an inheritance, and circumcision is the token, memento or seal of that contract. This is its object, and this is the sum of its value.

"But, says Paul, this is *not* the sum of its value. The most precious promise in that covenant was, 'I will be a God to thee and to thy seed after thee,' and '*If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise*'—see Gal. iii. 29. Heirs of what? Of the earthly Canaan? nay, but the *heavenly*. Think you that God made a covenant of *works*, saying, Circumcise your male offspring, and I will give you this land of Canaan for an inheritance? I tell you, nay. They did not inherit the promise in this world, but lived by *faith*, 'that it might be by grace; to the end that *the promise* might be sure to *all* the seed; not to that only which is of the *law*, but to that also which is of the *faith* of Abraham, who is the *father of us all*, as it is written, I have made thee a father of *many nations*,' (Rom. iv. 16, 17). Here Paul quotes a part of this covenant (see Gen. xvii. 5) for fear it might be understood to refer to some other promise, and this puts the matter beyond question or cavil, that he is speaking of *the promise in the covenant with Abraham*, of which circumcision is the seal, the *original* seal, and which promise and covenant are inherited by the Gentiles as well as by the Jews, so that Abraham is the *father of us all*, and thereby the word of God is literally fulfilled, 'A father of many nations have I made thee,' (Gen. xvii. 5).

"And Paul further remarks, I recognise this promise, 'I will be a God to thee,' as involving the most precious blessings of the Gospel of Christ: 'Ye are the temple of the living

God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them and walk in them, *and I will be their God*, and they shall be my people" (see 2 Cor. vi. 16), that is, *their* God as he is not the God of other men, and they *his* people, as other men are not his people. Also see Heb. viii. 10, 'This is the covenant that I will make with the *house of Israel* after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people.'

"But were there not temporal blessings included in that covenant?" asked Anna.

"Yes, very many," continued Halley; "as their title and possession of the land of Canaan, their prominence among the nations around them, their success against their enemies, and in fact *all* their worldly advantages and privileges. But all these were subordinate — were really only appendages to the great spiritual benefits flowing from these connections to the obedient in *heart*, not the *letter* only. Just so it is under the Gospel dispensation: all necessary temporal blessings are promised unto believers; for Christ said, 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and *all these things shall be added unto you.*' Also 'Godliness is profitable unto all things, having the *promise of the life that now is*, as well as of that which is to come.' Thus it follows that the religion of the Jews was as truly spiritual when lived out according to the requirements of the law of God, and was essentially the same as that of the Christian world now. The difference was only in the *form* of worship, and not in the worship itself. God exhibited to them the same character as to us, and required the same character and life of his people under the old dispensation as under the new. If any one doubts this, he had better search the Scriptures and see if he can find better Gospel piety than that of Enoch, Abraham, Elijah, Samuel, David, and a host of others; and then point out, if he can, the difference between this and the other.

Again, the same demands are made of the Jews and the followers of Christ. See Deut. vi. 5, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.' See Matt. xxii. 37, 'Jesus said unto them, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.'

"See also Lev. xx. 7, 'Sanctify yourselves, therefore, and be ye holy, for I am the Lord thy God.' Compare with this, I Peter i. 15-16, 'But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation; because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy.'

"Now I think we have shown, that so far as the Israelites kept the covenant God made with them through Abraham, just so far it was the source (and circumcision was the seal) of great spiritual blessings to all parties included in the covenant."

"I have been taught," said Anna, "that all Jewish rites and ceremonies found a natural end and death in Christ. What is there to support this idea?"

"We are taught," replied Halley, "that all rites and ceremonies that typified Christ found in him a natural end, and why should they not? Turn to Gal. 3d chapter, a part of which you referred to a short time since, and you will find the whole matter set forth very plainly. The Apostle makes a distinction between the Mosaic ritual and God's covenant with Abraham. He says, speaking of this ritual and the Mosaic law, 'The law was *added* because of transgression.' He teaches that the Mosaic economy was earthly and changeable; but God's covenant with Abraham, spiritual and unalterable, securing all the blessings that the believer in Christ is entitled to. You must bear in mind, also, that this covenant was established four hundred years previous to the law; and *if the giving of the law did not annul the covenant, certainly the covenant would not be annulled by the removing of the law, by the abrogation of the Mosaic ritual.* And this is the very thing concerning which

Paul was arguing, and which the Holy Ghost teaches through his arguments; that is, that the covenant, and its blessings and privileges remain, although the law is done away; and that this covenant, with its requirements and attendant blessings, comes upon the Gentiles through Jesus Christ. The Mosaic economy was *not the church*, but only the drapery of it. The state was intended as a shield and protection to the church, and when it passed away, the church was still as complete as when it first came from the hands of God."

"Is it not true," asked Anna, "that God, in his moral government, has closely connected the interests of parents and children in whatever they receive, whether blessings or curses?"

"Certainly; and no one will deny this," replied Halley; "who believes that through *one* man's transgression, fell the whole race of man — that through Adam's sin all his posterity have become sinners. We are suffering to-day in consequence of Adam's disobedience; we are continually prone to sin, and subject to disease, pain, sorrow, and death. God recognized and confirmed this principle of action in his moral government when he established his church upon earth; 'I will be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.' It is also recognized in all his dealings with his people as recorded in his word; saith Jehovah, 'I will visit the iniquities of the fathers upon their children, unto the third and fourth generations; and show mercy unto thousands (of generations) of them that love me and keep my commandments' (Ex. xx. 5-6).

"Again he says: 'They are the seed of the blessed of the Lord (Isa. lxx. 23), and their offspring with them.' It mattered not whether mercies or judgments fell upon the race of men, their children were equally partakers of the same. And how is it now? Look out upon society; see what wretchedness and misery the drunkard entails upon his family, upon his children, and even upon his children's children; see what moral evils the godless and openly vicious man brings upon his little ones,

when they go forth to meet and to take upon themselves the responsibilities of life! Witness on the other hand the blessings, temporal and spiritual, physical and moral, flowing from proper training and culture, where the parent faithfully discharges his duty both to his child and to his God. 'Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it — train them up in the fear and admonition of the Lord;' these are inspired teachings, and when fully complied with, are invariably accompanied with manifold blessings."

"Did not Christ recognize the same principle, when he said to the Scribes and Pharisees, as recorded in Matt. 23d chapter; 'Ye are the children of them that killed the prophets; fill ye up the measure of your fathers, that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth from the blood of righteous Abel, unto the blood of Zacharias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar; verily I say unto you, *all* these things shall be required of this generation.' Is not the same principle here inculcated?" asked Anna.

"Yes," replied Halley; "and this prophecy of our Savior, and the curse denounced upon that generation of unbelievers, met with a most terrible fulfillment and realization at the destruction of Jerusalem shortly after (A. D. 70). Most truly did Jesus exclaim: 'For there shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be' (Matt. xxiii. 21). The city was leveled to the dust; mothers were forced by famine to eat their own children; and by pestilence and by sword, at Jerusalem and through Judea, not less than three millions of Jews were swept off as by the scourge of God. There was truly woe, woe, to Jerusalem!

"Now by a little reflection you will perceive, that we have shown, (1) that all of Adam's posterity, who have at any time come into covenant with God, have effected this through grace in a Mediator: for 'There is none other name, given under

heaven among men, whereby we can be saved.' And if God has dealt with his people *only* on this principle, since they failed in works; then the church was built on this at the first, and is still built on it. (2.) God's church, the only church he has ever established on earth, built on the principle of grace, with Christ as its head (John viii. 56), and faith as its ground of justification (Gal. iii. 8), requiring supreme love to God (Deut. vi. 5), and holiness of life (Lev. xx. 7), *was established in the family of Abraham* (Gen. xvii. 7). (3.) God made the covenant of this church, and fixed its terms of membership; and no one can deny that he included the children of the believer in the same covenant with the believing parent: 'I will establish my covenant with thee, and thy seed after thee;' and God has never since then *repealed it*, or *any part* of it.

"Also by his command, they were, both parent and child, to have administered to them the *same* outward visible rite, which was the token or sign of this covenant; and which Paul declares '*the seal*,' not of a worldly inheritance—a mere spot of earth for a dwelling-place, but *the 'seal of the righteousness of faith*;' and by God's plan and *express* command, this seal of faith was placed upon those *who could not exercise faith*. Who has changed the decrees and plans of God? God himself made this covenant, and declared it to be everlasting; he also fixed its terms and conditions. He alone had a right to determine who are entitled to its privileges and promises; and he has determined it, and declared it. He alone can abrogate it. He alone can change it, or its terms, its tokens, or anything appertaining thereto. We grant no such right to you, our Baptist friends, unless you show your commission from the Most High God! Point us to a command in the entire word of God separating parent and child. Point us to a command forbidding the consecration of children to God; and that consecration to be effected by placing on them the seal of God's everlasting covenant. If you cannot do this—and you know you cannot—

why do you undertake to change God's terms, privileges and requirements, without his authority? Why put forth your puny arm to make void the commandments of God?

"Now the *onus probandi* falls on you. We have shown how God organized his church; we have shown whom he includes in the covenant, and to whom, according to his express command, the seal should be administered; and now if he has ever revoked this, it devolves on *you* to show *WHERE*. Will you make the effort—it will prove a fruitless effort! There will be but *one* response to all your labor, and that will be but the *echo of your own question!* Through the dim vista of the past you will hear but an empty sound—a *lone echo*, looking back through four thousand years, which will answer *WHERE* to your every inquiry! It cannot be found in the Bible—you search there in vain. Throughout the entire word of God there is no annulling, revoking, or repealing of this covenant. Will you then resort to tradition, and to the history of the church? We are willing to follow you there; for we can confront you with unquestionable and abundant testimony, showing that from the time of the Apostles this covenant has been in force, and Infant Baptism recognized and practised."

As Halley paused, there followed a silence of some moments, during which each was busy with his own thoughts.

"God covenanted with Abraham," thought Anna; "God covenanted with him and his seed, to be their God and they should be his people. Paul says: '*If ye are Christ's, ye are Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise.*' Then if I have hope in Christ to-day, I am *Abraham's seed*. God's omniscient eye was on me when he made that covenant, and I was included in its terms, and through it I am heir of the promise, that the God of Abraham should be my God. Verily God, the Lord, is *one God*, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever; from eternity to eternity an unchangeable God."

Tanner's thoughts were surging differently. He was a

worldly-minded Christian; the representative of a large class, who think it well enough to serve self six days, and God one. He was chagrined at the failure of his argument, and was seeking earnestly after some quibble, peculiar to his profession, whereby he might turn the tables in his own favor.

"It seems to me," said Elder Clayton, the first to break the silence, "that this being the case, it would have been taught more plainly in the New Testament."

"There is scarcely a truth more plainly taught in the New Testament than this," replied Halley. "But what matters it *where*, in what part of God's word, a truth is taught? Is not the whole Bible the word of God, and one part of it as true and infallible as another? A *truth*, whether found in Genesis or Revelations, *is truth* nevertheless, and *God's truth*, and woe be to him who taketh therefrom or addeth thereto! We have, as yet, by no means exhausted this subject; but as it is growing somewhat late, and some of you perhaps are already wearied, we had better adjourn till to-morrow, when we will, if you please, meet here and resume the investigation; and in the mean time let each of us 'search the Scriptures,' and see what testimony we can individually find and bring forward. But it seems to me, no more is needed to carry conviction to an unprejudiced mind. Let us glance back and take a hasty survey of the ground we have already been over; and for your satisfaction, Elder Clayton, we will confine ourselves entirely to New Testament testimony. Paul says (Gal. iii. 16): 'Now to Abraham and to his seed were the promises made.' And you ask does this promise reach to the Gentiles? Was not that the end of the promise and the covenant? Paul replies, Nay, but Christ hath redeemed us, 'That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ' (Gal. iii. 14). But you ask what is this blessing and this promise to Abraham and to his seed? Let me also ask why these blessings and promises are not said to be to the children of Enoch, who walked with God,

or of Noah, of Elijah, of Moses, or of David, the man after God's own heart? All these had faith and were justified by faith; and if simply *to be justified by faith*, be the reason we are 'Abraham's seed,' can any one tell why we might not as well be called the seed of Enoch or of David?

"The answer plainly is that it has reference to something more than this—to something that *was established* in the family of Abraham, something *confirmed to Abraham*, something that is *transmitted from Abraham*, and this something was promised to Abraham and to his seed in an *everlasting covenant*, and this covenant had reference not only to all his posterity down to the time of our Savior, and thence down to our time; but looks onward to all the generations yet to come, before the church militant, then established and confirmed in the family of Abraham, shall become the church triumphant in the kingdom of God.

"Paul further says: '*If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise*' (Gal. iii. 29). We *inherit* something: something is *transmitted*. Again (Gal. iii. 8), 'The Scriptures foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the GOSPEL *unto Abraham*.'

"The Gospel was therefore preached unto Abraham *before* it was preached to the Gentile, and Abraham believed: that faith of his must then have been a Gospel faith, and he was justified before God through Christ. Our Savior says (John viii. 56), 'Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad.'

"God established this covenant and declared it an '*everlasting covenant*.' He established it on the principle of Grace through faith in our common Mediator and Redeemer, and consequently it must have been a *Gospel covenant* and a promise confirmed in Christ. Would Christ then annul it? 'Think not,' says he in Matt. v. 17 and 18, 'that I am come to destroy

the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.'

"And do you ask, was not the ceremonial law so blended with the covenant, that when that was abrogated, on its end being accomplished, the covenant was made void also? Let Paul answer: 'And this I say (Gal. iii. 17), That the covenant that was *confirmed before of God* in Christ; the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, *cannot disannul*, that it should make the promise of none effect.'

"This is definite, and should be satisfactory. But you ask again, Did not Christ, when he fulfilled the law, make an end of these old promises also, which were made to the fathers?

"Let Paul answer again: Romans xv. 8, 'Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, *to confirm the promises made unto the fathers.*'

"Then we have proved from the New Testament, that this covenant and promise has not passed away, that it has not been disannulled, but has been confirmed in Christ Jesus. This harmonizes with the declaration of Jehovah himself when it was made; that it was to be an everlasting covenant. We have as yet brought forward only a part of the testimony in the New Testament on this subject; but who will contradict or gainsay what has already been adduced? Dare you affirm without a shadow of evidence from God's word, that one of the parties in this covenant confirmed by our Savior, has been thrown out, and consequently deny the seal to that party? Let those who would do this, pause and reflect, lest they be guilty of fighting against God! Guilty of *forgery* on God's word!"

"FORGERY! that is a serious charge," said Elder Clayton. "I'm sure we design doing no such thing."

"Yet, you nevertheless do it," continued Halley, "if you throw the children of believers out of this covenant, and deny

them the seal. You commit nothing less than forgery on this contract which God made with his people. I will convict you from the mouth of your own authority, Squire Tanner, the author you are so fond of quoting. Remember God fixed the terms of this covenant, pronounced it to be *everlasting*, and then *affixed the seal*. Says Mr. J. R. Graves (see *THE GREAT IRON WHEEL*, p. 442): ‘Let us look into the nature of sealing. When the seal of state or of an individual is affixed to a document, that document must *forever remain in the letter and spirit* in which it existed *when sealed*. To enter a *new clause* or to *change a line of an old one* would be FORGERY.’ And now I ask you, Squire Tanner, if Mr. Graves is not convicted of forgery by the testimony of his own mouth? Is he not a forger in the sight of God? Has he not, in that volume you have been perusing, *changed more than ONE line*, not only in God’s word, but also in God’s everlasting covenant, to which He had affixed His seal?”

CHAPTER X.

“WHAT IS WRITTEN IN THE LAW? HOW READEST THOU?”—Luke x. 26.

“It is one thing to read the Bible through,
 And another to read to learn and do;
 It is one thing to read it with delight,
 And quite another to read it RIGHT.
 Some read it as their duty once a week,
 But no instruction from the Bible seek;
 Whilst others read it with but little care,
 With no regard to how they read, nor where!
 Some read it as a history, to know
 How people lived three thousand years ago.
 Some read to bring themselves into repute,
 By showing others how they can dispute;

Whilst others read because their neighbors do,
 To see how long 'twill take to read it through.
 Some read it for the wonders that are there,
 How David kill'd a lion and a bear;
 Whilst others read, or rather in it look,
 Because, perhaps, they have no other book.
 Some read the blessed Book, they do'nt know why,
 It somehow happens in the way to lie;
 Whilst others read it with uncommon care,
 But all to find some contradictions there!
 Some read to prove a *pre-adopted* creed,—
 Thus understand but little what they read,
 For every passage in the book they bend,
 To make it suit that all-important end!
 Some people read, as I have often thought,
 To teach the Book, instead of being taught;
 And some there are who read it out of spite,
 But *few* there are, I fear, who read it **RIGHT.**"

THE morrow found Elder Clayton's study crowded with eager listeners. Squire Tanner was there also, industriously searching his text-book for arguments. Anna smiled half-unconsciously as she noted his eagerness, and glanced from his text-book to her own.

"I have marked some passages in the Bible, which seem to me to be bearing on the subject in question," said Anna, in reply to Halley's inquiry after individual researches for Bible proofs.

"We will first, then," continued Halley, "examine what you and others have gathered from the Sacred Scriptures on this question. Present your texts, Miss Anna, if you please."

"As it regards the mission of John," began Anna, with much diffidence and in a subdued tone, which soon, however, grew firmer and stronger, as she seemed to forget, in her interest in the subject before her, the many attentive listeners around her, "the angel Gabriel told Zacharias, John's father,

that 'He should be great in the sight of the Lord. And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God. And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, *to make ready a people prepared for the Lord*' (Luke i. 15-17).

"Here is not a trace of even an allusion to the setting up of a Gospel Gentile church, or of any church. His mission was 'to the children of Israel.' Shortly after the angel appeared to Mary, and told her she should bear a son, who should be called the Son of the Highest; and God should give unto him the throne of his father David, and that *he should reign over the house of Israel forever*, and of his kingdom there should be no end: see Luke i. 32-33. That does not sound to me like the setting up of a *new kingdom*, for he sits on the *throne of David*, and reigns over the *house of Israel*. Mary afterward exclaimed: 'He hath holpen *his servant Israel* in remembrance of his mercy, as he spake to our fathers, *to Abraham, and to his SEED FOREVER.*' After this, Zacharias, filled with the Holy Ghost, prophesied, saying: 'Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people, and hath raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David; as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began; to perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and *to remember his holy covenant; the oath that he sware unto our father Abraham.*'

"Here it is declared that Christ is comprehended in that covenant, and that he came in fulfillment of the 'oath He sware unto Abraham.' That certainly does not favor the idea of the covenant being a legal contract for the possession of the land of Canaan, but a contract confirming and insuring the atonement of Christ. Pious Simeon also, moved by the Holy Ghost, declared the infant Jesus to be 'a light, to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel.' Also in Luke iv. 18, when

Christ entered the synagogue, and opened the book of the prophet Esaias (Isaiah), and read: 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord.' There is nothing yet about the setting up of a visible church as the one object of his mission: it seems to have been so important a part of his work, that he never mentioned it! Again, in John x. 16, Jesus says to the Pharisees in his parable of the Good Shepherd: 'And other sheep I have which are not of *this fold* (then he had a fold at that time), them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be *ONE fold and ONE Shepherd.*' And Caiaphas, the high-priest, prophesied, saying: 'That Jesus should die for that nation, and not for that nation only, but that he should gather together *in one* the children of God that were scattered abroad.' His fold and 'that nation,' were the Jews; his other sheep and those 'scattered abroad,' were the Gentiles which he brought in among the Jews, and they became 'one fold,' and over them there was 'one Shepherd.'"

Squire Tanner remarked that to him it was perfectly plain that Christ organized and established a visible church, which was usually designated the "kingdom of God." That was what Christ preached; he preached the kingdom of God, and gathered all true believers into it. He then opened his text-book (THEODOSIA ERNEST), page 305, and read: "Now when Christ came into the world, *one* great object, if not *the* great object of his mission, was to *establish his visible church.* He set it up himself. He instructed his disciples carefully in the nature of its law. * * * Now the *most important* of these fundamental rules was that which fixed the terms of membership in his kingdom. This lay at the foundation of the whole business. The character, the influence, the prosperity of his kingdom

must depend upon the character of the persons of whom it was composed. Now the Jewish kingdom, though it had in it much of good, and was a beautiful type of better things to come, yet it had included more of the evil than the good. * * * But now Christ was organizing not a *temporal*, but a *spiritual* kingdom. His dominion was to be one of interior rule—by the power of love. The subjects of this kingdom were to be *converted men and women*, who loved God and lived to his glory. No one could belong to it, as he told Nicodemus, who had not *been born again*. This was his church”—(The italics are Mr. Graves’).

“In the first place,” replied Halley, “we have an assertion that Christ’s mission was ‘to set up a visible church.’ Second, that he instructed his disciples in the nature of its laws, and particularly in its terms of membership. Third, he states that it was *not a visible church*, but a *spiritual church*! For what is spiritual is of necessity not visible. No man hath at any time seen a spirit, or anything spiritual, except through the eye of faith: visible objects are seen through the natural eye—the eye of sense. Fourth, the terms of membership, regarding which Christ so faithfully instructed his disciples, were conversion: ‘Ye must be born again to enter the kingdom of God.’ Now this is beautiful reasoning! just such as he has served up all along in his work for his readers! And is it not particularly flattering, if he supposes they have not discernment enough to discover the fallacy? Where is the logical sequence in all this commingling of ideas and sentences? It will require a stronger and more powerful combining principle than any to be found in the whole department of chemistry, to effect here a uniting of the different elements, and thereby form a logical or even chemical connection! *The object of Christ*, he informs us, was to set up here a *visible church*! He does not venture even a single proof-text; and for the best reason in the world, for he could not find one. I shall therefore beg leave to differ from him, inasmuch as I have somehow got the impression, that the

one great object of the mission of our Savior Jesus Christ, was to make an atonement for our sins by meeting the requirements of the law in our stead. I am probably indebted for this idea to Paul, who said: 'God sent forth his Son to redeem them which are under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons' (Gal. iv. 5). Also Jesus himself said, 'I have come to seek and to save that which was lost. Think ye that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets? I tell you, Nay; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved. Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many!

"This is our Savior's own definition and statement of the purpose of his mission; but not a word said about setting up a visible church. Again: He instructed his disciples carefully in the nature of its laws.—Granted. There is no truth more plainly taught than who are fit members of his kingdom. 'Blessed are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of God. Blessed are the peace-makers; for they shall be called the children of God. Blessed are they who shall be persecuted for righteousness sake; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you; do good to them that hate you; and pray for them that despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven. For if ye love them that love you, what reward have you? And if ye salute your *brethren* only, what do ye more than others.'

"Again: Christ was organizing not a temporal, but a spiritual kingdom. This is also granted: although he sat upon the throne of David and shall reign over the *house of Israel forever*: and of his kingdom there shall be no end (See Luke i. 32 and 33).

“There is to be *no end* to his kingdom, and so of necessity it is spiritual; for we have not yet formed the acquaintance of anything visible and temporal but that there is an end to it.

“Once more: The terms of membership to Christ’s spiritual kingdom—that one of which there is to be no end—are, ‘Ye must be born again.’ That, certainly, is Gospel truth. But why attempt to mystify, and to blend the two in one? Why tell us that Christ came to set up a *visible* church, and then add that it was not a *temporal* but a *spiritual* kingdom? And why do you thereafter append thereto, that no one *can*, and that *none do* enter it but those born of the Spirit, and thereby endeavor to leave the impression that this is Christ’s command and declaration with regard to membership in his church militant—his visible church? What have you to say, Miss Anna, to such a process of reasoning as this?”

“I think,” replied Anna, “that to suppose the terms ‘kingdom of heaven,’ and ‘kingdom of God,’ as used by our Savior, meant a visible church, which Christ came to set up, involves an absurdity. I have marked some passages in which it occurs. It could not have been a *new* one, certainly, set up at his coming; for he says: ‘There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in *the kingdom of God* (the visible church!), and you yourselves thrust out’ (See Luke xiii. 28). If these old Patriarchs are in it, can it be a new church? And can it be a *visible* church? When our Savior was questioned of the Pharisees with regard to the coming of the kingdom of God, he answered (Luke xvii. 20 and 21): ‘The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo, here! nor Lo, there! for behold, the kingdom of God *is within you.*’ This sounds also very much like the reply he made to Pilate when asked: ‘Art thou the king of the Jews?’ His reply was: ‘My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight; but now is my kingdom not from hence.’

“And further: if the term, ‘kingdom of God’ means a visible church, we can hardly reconcile with truth all the declarations of Christ! He said: ‘It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God.’ It does not seem to be a difficult matter for a rich man to enter a visible church, and I am sure he creates a greater sensation among his brethren there than a poor man. But how is it with Christ’s invisible, spiritual kingdom, of which there is no end, and he, our Savior, the only door of entrance? I leave it for the Master himself to decide; and he says, *it is difficult*.

“Again, if Christ meant his visible church by the term ‘kingdom of God,’ he must have thought it would be very different from what it is; and this would seriously reflect on his omniscience, for he said: ‘Ye must be born again, or ye cannot enter into the kingdom of God.’ That very many do enter the visible church who are not born of the Spirit, I suppose no one will deny; and yet we have the testimony of Jesus himself, that *no one can enter HIS kingdom* unless born of the Spirit. That any one should quote such a text as that to prove membership of a *visible church*, indicates a weakness of judgment and intellect not at all enviable, or a dishonesty of character wholly anti-Christian; or at least, it is resorting to means unworthy a good cause, and shows very conclusively that he has but little faith in the truth of the position taken. Your author — Mr. Graves — says also, on page 307, that baptism is the *door of entrance* to this church, which cannot be entered unless born of the Spirit! Where is his authority? Jesus says: ‘Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber. Verily, I say unto you, *I am the door*. I am the door; by me if any man enter in he shall be saved’ (see John, 10th chapter).

“If the author of that work or any other man enters Christ’s

fold through the *door of baptism*, the word of God very plainly points out how he is regarded by our Savior. I desire no other door to the fold of the Great Shepherd of souls, than Christ himself; and I have the blessed assurance from the Master himself, that if I enter through him *I shall be saved*: but how is it with him who climbeth up some other way? Look ye well to it, who enter only by the door of baptism; Christ recognizes no such door; remember he says, '*I am the door.*'"

"In view of these passages of Scripture, and others similar," said Halley, "what idea do you gather from the term in question?"

"I think," responded Anna; "that the term kingdom of God means the spiritual rule of Christ in the hearts of all those, and those only, who are sealed unto redemption by the Spirit of truth begun in this world, and perfected when 'The king shall say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world' (see Matt. xxv. 34)."

"But why were they said to preach the Gospel of the kingdom?" asked Halley.

"The preaching of the Gospel, God has been pleased to institute as the means through which man's attention is arrested, and he thereby is led into the kingdom."

"What authority, then, is left us? Where are the evidences from the Bible which testify that the setting up of a visible church was the mission of Christ?" asked Halley. "There is nothing remaining in support of it, save the bare assertion of Brother Baptist; and one would hardly think he would desire to retain so awkward a position. He thereby endeavors to make it appear that this visible church, he is speaking of, is something essentially different from the Jewish church. But after all his labor, it proves to be a distinction without any difference. The net is cast into the sea, and whether it captures Jews or Gentiles, it brings both the good and bad to shore.

The tares and wheat grow together in this world, and there is no separation until the harvest. Paul recognized this of the Jewish church, when he said: 'They are not all Israel which are of Israel.' And again, in Romans, 11th chapter: 'Hath God cast away his people? God forbid! God hath not cast away his people, which he foreknew. Wot ye not what the Scripture saith of Elias? How he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying, Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life. But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal. Even so then at this present time also, there is a remnant according to the election of grace. And if by grace, then it is no more of works; otherwise, grace is no more grace.' Does Paul imply that there is any *new* requirement of God's people under the new dispensation — does he indicate any such thing? So far from it, that he rather on all occasions, holds up those who lived in accordance with the old requirement, AS EXAMPLES *in all the Christian virtues*. Hear him in Heb. 11, 'Faith is the substance of things hoped for. Without faith it is impossible to please God.' This is then what is now required of us under the gospel dispensation, and by it we are accepted: is it a new requirement? Let Paul answer. 'By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain. By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death. By faith Noah became heir of the righteousness which is by faith. By faith Abraham offered up Isaac. By faith Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau. By faith Jacob blessed the two sons of Joseph. By faith Joseph made mention of the departing of the children of Israel. By faith Moses was hid. By faith he refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter. By faith he forsook Egypt. Through faith he kept the passover. By faith he passed through the Red Sea. By faith the walls of Jericho

fell down. By faith Rahab perished not. And what shall I say more? for the time would fail me to tell of Gideon, and of Barak, and of Sampson, and of Jephtha; of David, also, and Samuel, and of the prophets: who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens. Women received their dead raised to life again; and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection; and others had trials of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonment; they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword; they wandered about in sheep-skins and goat-skins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented; of whom the world was not worthy; they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens, and in caves of the earth.'

“This must have been a Gospel faith of the truest metal; and it is just such faith as this, which God required, ay, demanded, of all the children of Israel—from every one of them just as he demands it of his people now. It was demanded in the covenant he established with them. God said (Gen. xvii. 1), ‘Walk before me, and be thou perfect.’ It was subsequently demanded in the law of Moses; and later still, by all of God’s messengers, by whom he made known his will to his people. That *all* did not exercise it; that many, when trials and temptations came, fell away; does not prove that they were not connected with God’s church—does not prove that there was no church existing at that time, any more than it proves that there is no church now, and never has been any on earth. We have abundant evidence to lead us to believe that there is not a church in this Christian land that would stand the test of civil persecutions, imprisonments, torture, and ignominious death, without a sad number of apostasies.

“That the Jewish church in the time of Christ was in a worldly and spiritless state, is nothing more than might be said, with truth, of many churches in our midst at the present day; and was said, even in the time of the Apostles, of some they planted and watered. God’s church has ever been the same in a spiritual sense. He has ever required the same character of its members, and exhibited to them the same character of himself. It has differed only in circumstances, and those purely external. Supreme love to God is demanded of all, and has ever been, as we have proved by numerous texts; and all who were justified were justified not by works, but by grace bestowed through the exercise of true living gospel faith in the atonement *to be made* for them and all the world. And this atonement was brought to view every time a sacrifice lay bleeding upon the altar. So likewise the rite of circumcision was of the same nature and equally spiritual with the ordinance of baptism. It was so called by Paul, Rom. ii. 29, ‘Circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter.’ It was the sign or symbol of the regeneration of the heart. Turn to Deut. xxx. 6: ‘And the Lord thy God *will circumcise thy heart,* AND THE HEART OF THY SEED, to love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live.’ This is *all* that can be claimed for the ordinance of baptism; it is a *sign* of the regeneration of the heart—the sanctification of the Spirit; which operation is performed that we may live before God. This is its *generic* sense: specifically under this it is a *seal*. Baptism is the seal of that faith by which we lay hold on the promises of God: and that was precisely the import of circumcision in a specific sense. Paul says that it was ‘a seal of the righteousness of faith.’ And the child was only eight days old, and therefore incapable of understanding, or making a covenant. Yet by God’s command and appointment children were included in this covenant with the believing

parent; and because included, must have affixed to them the seal of the covenant.

“Why does not your author, Squire Tanner, turn up his nose in a sickly sneer at infant circumcision, as well as at infant baptism? He says, p. 202: ‘Can a little babe, mewling and puking in its mother’s arms, be taught the doctrines of salvation?’ Why does he not directly charge God with having established an ordinance of cruelty, as well as one in its effects a nullity? The child could not understand it! And yet by God’s express command, ‘the seal of the righteousness of faith,’ was to be applied to one who could neither exercise faith, nor understand its import! By the appointment of Jehovah himself, the sign of the circumcision of the heart, or renewing of the Holy Ghost, was to be placed upon one whom your author says, ‘is a child of wrath, even as others:’ we say not; believing that God knows best.

“And now, as God has never revoked these commands, nor repealed this covenant, nor even abrogated any part of it, we feel it obligatory on us to give our child, in obedience to God’s requirements, *Christian circumcision*; knowing that it is not misplaced, even though it be ‘the sign of the circumcision of the heart, made without hands’—the purifying influences of the Holy Spirit—unless God himself has misplaced it! Who dare affirm that God has misplaced the seal of his own covenant? ‘We are the circumcision (Phil. iii. 3) which worship God in the Spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh.’

“Baptism is the seal of the same covenant, ordained for the same church. It means the same thing. It is employed for the same purpose, and circumcision is passed away. Baptism is now what circumcision was once; a seal of the righteousness of faith in God’s promises, to be our God and the God of our children. Christianity has no other sign or seal of the righteousness of faith. Says Mr. Hall, ‘It has been objected that

circumcision was applied only to *males*; might not this have been among the reasons for a change of the seal? A distinction was made between male and female under the Mosaic dispensation, as between Jew and Greek, bond and free; but under Christ this distinction is abolished: 'There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither *male* nor *female*.' Hence, the seal remaining, there was a necessity for changing its *form*.' But nothing is revoked in the covenant God made with his people—there has been no shadow of varying in its whole spirit—nothing has been changed save the *form* of the seal.

"But let us suppose for a moment that the Christian dispensation was so changed from the Jewish, as to exclude infants from the jurisdiction of the church; how would the Jews have regarded it?"

"But suppose there was no church; then they would not have been excluded from it;" rather tauntingly, and with an air of defiance, interrupted Tanner.

"You can suppose as many absurd notions as you please. But remember you come not so much in conflict with us, as with the word of God. The sacred Scriptures declare there *was a church*, and reiterate and enforce the idea again and again. You would just as soon deny the existence of a hell, if it subserved your interests to do so; the latter is certainly not more plainly taught than the former.

"According to your own reasoning, by the denial of the existence of a church at that time, you give to your Master, whom you profess to love and to serve, the lie! He says the Jews were in possession of the 'kingdom,' and that it was taken from them and given to the Gentiles—to us: to those who should bring forth the fruits thereof (See Matt. xxi. 43). Now you claim that the term 'kingdom of God,' even as used by our Savior, means invariably the visible church; and you refuse the testimony of the Great Head of the church, and call his

declaration virtually a metaphorical nonentity! You say, No! It can't be the church in this case; although if it do'nt mean the visible church, it can't mean anything; and therefore it here means just *nothing at all!*

“To such straits are people driven when they form their creed to support their own notions, and then torture the word of God to its support! Perhaps I am severe. I accuse not thus the great body of the Baptist church. I know too many noble, conscientious, and self-sacrificing Christians among them; whom I am proud to recognize as the fellow-members of the body of Christ Jesus. I refer to those leaders only in the church, who, when driven from their positions by the word of God, in cool, candid argument, choose to stoop to any subterfuge rather than confess themselves *driven*—to be in error! But one day they will be judged by this very word they thus torture.

“This, however, has been a digression. We were about to contemplate for a moment the position of affairs IF infants had been *excluded* from the jurisdiction of the church. Think you that the Jews would not have raised an outcry against this innovation of one of their most highly esteemed privileges, as they did against every other that was made? This the Jewish Christians esteemed one of their most precious privileges: and they were exceeding jealous of their rights and privileges, and held to everything handed down from their forefathers with the greatest tenacity, so that Peter and Paul both made concessions to them. Are we then to suppose that with all their attachments to former customs, and their Jewish jealousy about the slightest innovation or change in the old system, they would so calmly acquiesce in the exclusion of their children from the blessings and jurisdiction of the church as never to raise the *slightest objection*, or indulge in the *least murmur* on the occasion, or even to *mention* that such an exclusion had taken place? Far from it!

“But on the other hand, when the Gentiles were converted to the Christian faith, the Jewish Christians expected them to conform to the law and adopt the entire ritual of Moses, as well as of Christ. Even the Apostles regularly attended the temple worship, and performed as usual their accustomed ceremonies (See Acts xxi. 18–28).

“Multitudes of Jews after embracing Christianity still retained the rite of circumcision (Acts xxi. 20): ‘Many thousands of the Jews, who believed, were zealous of the law.’ They certainly then continued the custom of circumcising their children, and adopted Christianity as a system growing out of their own religion, but by no means superseding it (See Acts xxi. 21). Here it is stated that Paul had been charged with having taught that all the Jews which are among the Gentiles, those who lived in heathen countries only (and not those living in Jerusalem and Judea), should no longer conform to the Mosaic ritual. And this was considered by them as a severe charge. We may now call to mind that baptism was inseparably joined with circumcision in the Jewish church. When a proselyte was made, they invariably circumcised and baptized him and his children. Of course only the males were circumcised, but both males and females were baptized. Says the learned Jewish writer, Maimonides, ‘They baptized also young children. They baptize a little proselyte according to the judgment of the Sanhedrim: if he be deprived of his father, and his mother brings him to be made a proselyte, they baptize him (because none become proselytes without circumcision and baptism) according to the judgment or rite of the Sanhedrim; that is, that three men be present at the baptism, who are now instead of a father to him.’ And the Gemara, the second part of the Talmud, a sort of commentary on the Mishna, says: ‘If with a proselyte his sons and his daughters are made proselytes also, that which is done by their father redounds to their good.’ Again: ‘If an Israelite find a Gentile child or a Gentile infant,

and baptize him * * behold he is a proselyte.' Jewish converts and their children have always been blended together. They have always circumcised and baptized, they still continue to circumcise and baptize: and they and their little ones, their children, advance as aforesaid as inseparable associates into the Christian field. Under the Gospel dispensation, baptism was intended to supersede circumcision; yet this was left optional with the Jew. He was required, in perfect conformity with Moses and his teachings, to become the follower of one greater than Moses, and who taught as never man taught."

"Do you assert, Mr. Halley, that the Gospel has anything to do with infants?" asked Squire Tanner, as he looked up quite abstractedly from the book he had been consulting. "It is stated here, sir, on page 206, by Mr. Graves, whom we consider good Baptist authority, that 'The Gospel has nothing to do with infants.' What have you to say to that?"

"I have to say, sir, that that assertion is merely the *ipse dixit* of your author, without a shadow of proof in its support. Look at the absurdity of the position, sir! Although the Gospel was preached unto Abraham, and by divine appointment parent and child had traveled together in inseparable covenant relations for nearly *two thousand years*, yet without finding *one* command or one clause, not even one word, in all the Bible, which, truly weighed, has a tendency to dissolve this relation; notwithstanding all this, your author shoulders the responsibility, and pronounces these relations dissolved, and declares further that the Gospel never had anything to do with infants!

"And what is still more unaccountable, he would have the parent yield to this innovation without even a murmur, fully persuaded that He who had 'gathered the lambs in his arms and carried them in his bosom,' and had said, 'Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not,' would not gladly receive them! And more wonderful still, the parent persists in circumcising his child, whilst at the same time he is assured

that 'the Gospel has nothing to do with infants,' and that they are shut out from the privileges and blessings of the church of God!

"And further, whilst the Apostles take the greatest pains to set them right on all other points, and even incur their resentment for their faithfulness in this duty, yet they suffer this glaring contradiction between *principle* and *practice* to continue without a syllable of disapprobation! This is your position, Squire Tanner; is it probable — is it reasonable even?

"Whatever the Apostles might have been, it is unmistakably evident that they were as unlike as possible to your author there; or they would have denounced this *infant consecration* as 'impious,' 'sacrilegious,' 'daring rebellion against God,' etc., making such an uproar and outcry that the Christian church would have left at least as much as *one text* on record for our Baptist brethren to preach from.

"But on the other hand how different from this are the facts in the case! The Apostles declared that the covenant remains unaltered; and so as a matter of *necessity* all the parties of the covenant remain in the same connection. Peter, on the day of Pentecost, being full of the Holy Ghost, stood up before the vast multitude assembled at Jerusalem, and said unto them: 'Repent and be baptized, every one of you, FOR the promise is (still) to you and your children, and all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call' (See Acts ii. 38, 39). And again in his second address (Acts iii. 25): 'Ye are the children of the prophets and the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.'

"Is it not worthy of notice that Peter refers to some particular covenant here? In the original it is καὶ τῆς διαθήκης (*kai tēs diathēkēs*) and properly rendered is — 'and of THE covenant.' And also in the passage above it is 'THE promise is to you and to your children,' *i. e.* the promise of God unto Abraham, 'to be a God unto thee and unto thy seed after thee.'

“No one can consistently or intelligently deny, that these passages refer directly to *the* covenant and *the* promise made to Abraham and to his posterity. And Paul says (Gal. iii. 29), ‘If ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to *the* promise.’ The promise then in which God engages to be our God, and to constitute us his people, is the one made to Abraham and to his seed; and it *equally* extends to us and to our children, even down to eight days old, by divine appointment; for God declared it to be an *everlasting* covenant to Abraham and to his seed; and the Apostles declared it to be still in force, and to extend to the Gentiles; and Paul declared further, to settle the matter and to make it perfectly plain, that ‘if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.’ Does it not then follow, that if we are Christians, we come under this same covenant, and enjoy its privileges, and partake of its promises? And moreover, it just as plainly follows that it is imperatively binding on us to comply with the requirement on our part in the covenant, and to have the *seal* of the covenant affixed to us and to our children.”

“But by the word children,” said Tanner, “is meant *posterity*, and not necessarily *infants*.”

“The word ‘seed’ used in the passages above cited,” replied Halley, “means also *posterity*—the earliest as well as the latest posterity—the youngest children in the family, as well as the most distant successor, and they are all included in the same covenant.”

“Do you think, Mr. Halley, that Peter meant infants in the passage you quoted just now; where he says ‘the promise is to you and to your children’?” asked Elder Clayton, thoughtfully.

“Peter speaks to all who are capable of understanding him. This vast multitude he calls ‘*you*.’ Now who can he possibly mean by the children of his hearers, but those children they had then—even the infant offspring—and also those they might

have thereafter? And if the promise to the adults be a reason for their being baptized, it must also be a reason for baptizing their children, since the promise is to both, and made the foundation of their baptism. But our Baptist brethren would make Peter a weak reasoner indeed. According to their construction, he says, The promise is to you, therefore be baptized; the promise is also to your children, therefore let them *not* be baptized. O, to what will party spirit not stoop to effect its ends! But notice: the Apostle says, the promise is to you and to your children; not *is* to you, and *will be* to your children when they become adults; but *IS NOW* to parents and little ones alike.

“And let us now further notice: Peter connects baptism with ‘the promise’ in the same manner that circumcision was connected with it. Under the old dispensation, the covenant and promise was to the believer, therefore he must be circumcised in token of this fact. The same covenant and promise included his child, therefore the child must be circumcised in token of this fact. Says Peter, ‘Repent and be baptized every one of you.’ Why? ask the Jews—the believing Jews. Because ‘the promise is to you and to your children.’ The promise is to the believer, and it is confirmed in the person of Jesus Christ. They believed, and consequently the promise was theirs, and they must be baptized. But the promise is also to the believer’s child, and therefore the believer’s child must be baptized. The believer is one born of the Spirit of God, and with him *only* the covenant is made. Baptism is now the seal of faith, and this seal the believer must receive as a token of his faith in God’s promises, and a *sign* of the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit upon the heart. But by God’s own appointment, which is never to be revoked or abrogated, the believer’s child by virtue of its relation to the believing parent, is also included in the same covenant and promise, and *with* its parent, receives the seal of faith, and sign of sanctification.

“In view of this testimony, Squire Tanner, have Pedobap-

tists 'in vain searched the Scriptures for evidence,—for a single precept or example — to justify the baptism of infants, as your author, Mr. Graves, affirms there on page 279? He who could in the abundant testimony of Revelation, declare such statements to be true, would say anything to effect his own designs. But if your author makes such a statement without the light of Revelation, without properly consulting his Bible, and therefore in the darkness of the ignorance of the spirit and tenor of the Old and New Testaments, then how great is that darkness! Now in connection with what has already been said, let me request you all, at your leisure, to read Romans iv. 11–12, and Gal. iii. 6–9, and 28–29, and then tell me what more a rational mind can want to confirm the facts I have stated.

Dr. Edwards commenting on Acts ii. 38–39, remarks: 'We should more certainly come at the truth, if instead of idly criticising, we could fancy ourselves Jews, and in the habit of circumcising infants and receiving them into the church; and then could we imagine one of our own nation and religion to address us in the language of Peter in the text: 'The promise is to you and to your children:' let us ask ourselves whether we could *ever suppose* him to mean adults only?'

"But Peter not only said, 'to you and to your children,' but also, 'them that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.' Thus he opened the door to the Gentile believer. And Paul said, 'Christ came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them which were nigh (Gentiles and Jews); for through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father' (see Eph. ii. 17–18). And again (in Eph. iii. 6): 'That the Gentiles should be FELLOW-HEIRS, and of the *same body*, and partakers of his PROMISE in Christ by the Gospel.'

"Will you now, Squire Tanner, if you please, turn to page 222 in your work there, and see what your author says of Dr. Woods?"

Tanner turned to the page and read: "So says also your other celebrated writer on this subject, Dr. Leonard Woods; 'The New Testament is silent respecting the subject of infant baptism. It is evident that infant baptism is not introduced as a subject of particular discussion. It is neither explicitly enjoined nor prohibited, and neither is the practice of baptizing children, nor the absence of it, expressly mentioned.'"

"Why, he must have been *almost a Baptist!*" exclaimed Halley. "But as I have his work here, I will read a little from it, and see if it sounds like that partial and fractional quotation made from him by your author; that quotation is in effect a *libel* on his views. Says Dr. Woods, *Infant Baptism*, 2d ed. page 43, 'Now my position is, *that the Scriptures of the New Testament, understood according to just rules of interpretation, imply that the children of believers are to be baptized.* The rule of interpretation, which is of the highest consequence, and which will aid us most in discovering the true meaning of the Scriptures in relation to the subject now before us, is, that we *put ourselves, as far as may be, in the place of those who gave instruction, and of those who received it.*

"You will easily perceive the importance and necessity of this rule. For in numberless instances, a declaration or direction derives its peculiar meaning from the consideration of the person who speaks, or of those to whom he speaks. Who does not know that the same combination of words has a very different meaning in one place from what it has in another? Even when the general sense of the words is the same, the circumstances of the case must determine the extent of the meaning which they bear, or what is implied in the application of them to the subject in hand. Some fact, some prevalent custom, or habit of thinking, may give them a specific signification; and without taking such fact or custom into view, we shall be likely to miss the exact sense and import of the words. In how many instances should we be at a loss respecting the meaning of his-

torians, poets, and orators, without taking into account the age and place in which they lived, and the character, laws, and usages of the people with whom they were conversant, and for whom they wrote.

“As a single illustration of the importance of this principle, look at a text in the Old Testament, in which God requires that the *Sabbath* should be sanctified. How do you ascertain which day is meant? Simply by considering what previous instructions and commands were given to the Israelites on the subject, and what their usage was. In this way we are satisfied that the *seventh* day was meant. Look now at a law, in an English or American statute-book, requiring the people to abstain from secular business on the *Sabbath*. How do you ascertain which day is meant here? In the same manner as before, by considering what has been the usage of Christians generally, and particularly of that people for whom the law was made. In this way we are satisfied that the *first* day of the week must be meant.

“Let us now come directly to the subject. Christ appointed baptism to be administered to all who should become proselytes to his religion, that is, to all Christians; and when he was about leaving his Apostles, who were to be employed as the instruments of converting the world, he gave them this commission; ‘Go ye, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.’ The word *μαθητευσατε* (*mathetusate*), rendered *teach*, properly signifies, *make disciples; proselyte; convert to the Christian religion*. The commission then is this; ‘Go ye, proselyte, or make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.’ This command was given by one who was born a Jew, and educated among the Jews, and was perfectly acquainted with all their institutions and laws, with their customs and usages, and with the dispensations of Divine Providence towards them. And

the command was addressed to *Jews*. Now whatever there was in the general circumstances, which could have an influence upon the meaning of the command, or which would naturally cause it to be understood in one way or another, is worthy of special attention.

“Let it be considered, then, that the Jews had long been accustomed to make proselytes from paganism to their religion. The obligation to do this had been brought to view in the divine law, and rules had been given for the proper treatment of proselytes. To make proselytes was regarded as a great object; and the efforts of the Jews to bring others to embrace their religion, were crowned with extensive success. Proselytes were numerous both in Greece and in Rome; and it seems that, after the persecuting reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, some whole nations, as the Idumeans, Itureans, and Moabites, professed the Jewish faith. And whenever Gentiles embraced the Jewish religion, they were treated in regard to circumcision according to the Jewish law; that is, they were circumcised,—*parents and children*. This was the law of the Jews; and this was the uniform practice. Hence it must be easy to determine how Christian Jews would be likely to understand the duty of proselyting idolators and unbelievers to the true religion. Suppose that God, previously to the Christian dispensation, had selected twelve Jews, and sent them forth to convert Greeks and Romans to their religion, and without any mention of children, had merely given them this commission: Go ye, *proselyte* and *circumcise* them. Would they not have understood such a commission as requiring them to circumcise the *children* of converted Greeks and Romans? Unquestionably they would. And why? *Because they were Jews, and had always been accustomed to the circumcision of children, as well as parents*. In obedience to this divine command, they would have gone to the people specified, and in all the instances in which men were made proselytes, would have circumcised them and their children.

“Again: suppose, in such a case, a command had been given, which included baptism with circumcision; thus: *Go ye, and proselyte those nations, circumcising and baptizing them.* Still not a word about *children*; but simply, Go and proselyte those nations to Judaism, *circumcising and baptizing them.* Most certainly, they would have understood that baptism, as well as circumcision, was to be applied to *proselytes and their children.*

“But suppose that baptism had been put in the place of circumcision, as the sign to be put upon proselytes to Judaism; and so the command to the Jewish teachers had been: *Go ye, proselyte and baptize the people of Greece and Rome.* Must they not have understood the command in the same way? Surely those who were acquainted with the commands and institutions which God gave to Abraham and to Moses, and who had always been accustomed to observe them, could have had no doubt, that the rite which marked the relation of proselytes to God, was to be applied to their children also.

Thus far, all must have the same opinion. Such a divine command to Jews before the time of Christ, whether it appointed circumcision only, or circumcision together with baptism, or baptism instead of circumcision, as a mark to be applied to those who were proselyted to the Jewish religion, must have been understood as intended to be applied also to the *children* of proselytes, though no mention was made of children in the command.

“I am now only availing myself of one of the most important principles of interpretation, and attempting to show, what influence must have been produced upon the meaning of Christ’s direction by the circumstance that he was a *Jew*, and that he gave the direction to *Jews*, whose laws and usages had been what the Scriptures represent.

“But to illustrate this principle still farther; suppose it to have been the appointment of our Savior, after his public min-

istry began, that circumcision should be applied to converts to Christianity, as it had been to converts to Judaism; and suppose him to have said to his Apostles; 'Go ye, proselyte all nations, and *circumcise* them,' making no mention of *children*. Could the Apostles have doubted a moment, in such a case, whether circumcision was meant to be applied to the *children* of proselytes? But why should we suppose they would put a different construction upon the commission they received from Christ, because *baptism* was made the sign of proselytes, instead of *circumcision*? There is evidently nothing in the import of the sign, which would require any difference in its application. For baptism is appointed simply as a sign, to be put upon those who are proselyted to Christianity. If *circumcision* had been continued, and Christ had commanded it to be put upon *Christian* proselytes, as it had been upon proselytes to the religion of Moses; the meaning and use of it would have been perfectly the same, as the meaning and use of baptism.

"Also Dr. Lightfoot says in reply to this objection, raised by our Baptist friends, that because infants are not *expressly* mentioned in the commission, they therefore are *excluded*: 'I answer, it is *not forbidden* to baptize infants, therefore they are to be baptized. And the reason is plain; for when *pedo-baptism* in the Jewish church was so known, usual, and frequent in the admission of proselytes, that nothing, almost, was more known, usual, and frequent; there was no need to strengthen it with any precept, when baptism was now passed into an evangelical sacrament. For Christ took baptism into his hands, and into evangelical use, as he found it; this only added, that he might promote it to a worthier end and a larger use. The whole nation knew well enough that *little children* used to be *baptized*, there was no need of a precept for that which had ever by common use prevailed. * * On the other hand therefore there *was* need of a plain and open PROHIBITION that infants and little children *should not be baptized*, if our Lord

would not have had them baptized. For since it was most common in all preceding ages that little children should be baptized, if Christ had been minded to have that custom abolished, he would have OPENLY *forbidden it*. Therefore *his silence*, and the silence of the Scriptures in this matter, *confirms* pedo-baptism, and continues it to all ages.'”

“Are not these arguments perfectly plain and unmistakable !” exclaimed Anna, wholly absorbed in the discussion, and her countenance lighted up with joyous intelligence, as if having discovered new truths, and broader fields of investigation. “Dr. Woods, and Dr. Lightfoot, and also Dr. Edwards arrived at the same conclusion which we reached ; and all, or nearly so, by different processes of reasoning ; and each process strengthens the others. What can be stronger—what can be more evident ? And, may I not ask, if there is not something in the instructions of Christ, which are of a *positive* character also, and such as would have fully satisfied the Apostles in what light he regarded the children of his people, and how he would have them treated ?

“In Matt. xix. 13 and 14, it is recorded : ‘There were brought to Jesus little children, that he should put his hands on them and pray ; and the disciples rebuked them. But Jesus said, Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me : for of such is the kingdom of heaven.’ In Luke xviii. 15, it is said, ‘And they brought unto him also infants, that he would touch them.’”

“In the passage in Luke,” said Halley, “the Greek word βρέφη (*brephe*) is used, which in our version is correctly rendered by the word *infants*, as it means *very young* children. Now your author, Squire Tanner, takes the position that the terms, ‘kingdom of heaven,’ and ‘kingdom of God,’ mean that *visible church polity*, which Christ came to set up, called his church ; but seeing a weak point in this argument here, he endeavors to make a distinction between Christ’s kingdom and Christ’s

church; which, however, is a distinction with no difference. He says (see THEODOSIA ERNEST, vol. ii. p. 150): ‘Baptism is the door of entrance into the visible kingdom, and through the kingdom into the church.’ And yet all that is necessary (see next page, 151) to get them through the *kingdom* into the *church*, is to *shake hands* with them! The mere act of shaking hands is sufficient to shake them out of the visible kingdom into the visible church! What a sublime idea! How his mind must have labored with such a thought! How finely and effectually he has thereby shielded himself from attack and overthrow, by so acutely evading the force of the Scripture teachings in this argument, founded upon his own premises!

“If the term ‘kingdom of heaven’ means Christ’s visible church, then Christ has declared infants to be members of it, and we receive them upon his *express command*: ‘Suffer them to come to me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven:’ FOR *they belong to my church*; and consequently the argument is at an end.”

“Hold!” said Tanner, opening his eyes wide with astonishment; “Christ says ‘*of such*,’ that is, of persons like them.”

“Ah!” said Halley, “another evasion! Then you would paraphrase it thus: ‘Suffer little children to come unto me, for my kingdom belongs not to them, but to adults, who resemble them in spirit!’ It would have been no more preposterous to say: Suffer *doves and lambs to come unto me*, for my kingdom consists not of them, but of adult persons of the genus *homo*, who have *dove-like* and *lamb-like* tempers! Such absurdity is its own refutation! But there are other passages in which the same Greek text occurs with no sensible difference. Anna, take your Bible, if you please, and read them. You will find many, but need read only two now: Matt. v. 3, and v. 10.”

Anna read: “Blessed are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.” Matt. v. 10: “Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness’ sake; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.”

“I suppose,” continued Halley, “you would have it read, Squire Tanner, that the kingdom of heaven does not belong to the *poor in spirit*, but only to such as resemble them; does not belong to those *who are persecuted for righteousness’ sake*, but only to those who are like them in temper!”

“No!” replied Tanner; “it is evidently no such thing; and I will not thus trifle with God’s truth!”

“Then you admit that Christ pronounced them blessed, *because* the kingdom of heaven belongs to such: in like manner also, you must admit that Christ said, ‘Suffer little children to come to me,’ *because* the kingdom of heaven belongs to them. Make what you will of these passages; the inspired word of God declares little children to be equally entitled to the privileges and blessings of Christ’s kingdom, with the ‘poor in spirit,’ and the ‘persecuted for righteousness’ sake.’ There is no getting round this truth. A critical examination of the text will strengthen this rendering beyond the shadow of a doubt. The Greek word *τοιούτων* (*toioutōn*), rendered in our version ‘*of such*,’ properly denotes the nature or quality of the thing to which it is applied, and is equal to such of this kind or sort. The passage, then, literally signifies, that to such children as these (for they had believing parents), the privileges of Christ’s kingdom belong. Also the declaration ‘of such is the kingdom of heaven,’ is expressly made the *reason* for suffering little children to come unto him.

“In all Greek, both Hellenistic and Classic, the Greek word γάρ (*gar*) is used to denote the *reason* of what has been asserted or implied. The declaration, then, ‘τῶν γάρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν’ (*tōne gar toioutōne estin hē basilia tōne ouranōne*): ‘for of such is the kingdom of heaven,’ must be understood as furnishing the REASON *why* little children were to be suffered to come unto Christ (See Woods on Infant Baptism, pp. 65–76).

“If now it is objected that the expression, ‘kingdom of

heaven' implies the kingdom of glory, or a heavenly state—as some prefer to consider it: we answer, very well; our argument is only *strengthened* by this view of the passage. For if our little children belong to the kingdom of glory, by virtue of their relation to the believing parent, and through the all-sufficient atonement made by our Savior, then much more do they belong to God's visible kingdom on earth, and we may *by right* demand the seal appointed to signify that interesting relation. If they already possess the thing *signified*, why withhold the *sign* of it? What right have you, and by what authority do you do this? Is there anything in the nature of the Christian church, to make it inconsistent to suppose that the children of believing parents are to have a part in it, and to avail themselves of its blessings and privileges? Does not the church militant belong properly to those, whom the great Head of the church has declared to be fit subjects for his church triumphant? Has any one doubts or difficulties on this subject?"

Elder Clayton had a difficulty in his mind, and after a few moments of silence he gave it expression, and said with a troubled, perplexed look: "But Christ did not *baptize* these little children!"

"Nor did he baptize adults," replied Halley; "but he did what was of more value, of far greater consequence, than the mere application of water to them. He took them in his arms and blessed them as his by adoption; and declared that they stood in the same relation to God and to his kingdom, as they had ever stood since the first organization of his church in the family of Abraham. By taking them in his arms and publicly recognizing them as subjects of his kingdom, he certainly authorized the application of whatever sign or seal might be appointed to distinguish the members of his kingdom from the world. And I would ask you, Elder Clayton, what evidence an adult believer could offer in relation to this point in question, more satisfactory than that involved in the relation which children, by

divine appointment, sustain to God's everlasting covenant? In one case we have a *profession* of repentance and faith, which may be *false*, and made from the *basest of motives*; and in the other, a declaration from the Master himself, that 'to such the kingdom of God belongs.' Who ever offered better evidence of his fitness for baptism, than such a certificate from the Great Head of the church? What more can you ask? Now look at it! On the very ground of our Baptist brethren, that the 'kingdom of heaven' means the *visible church*, Christ himself has declared that children have a right to its privileges and blessings—that they belong to it. On the other hand, where it is maintained that the term 'kingdom of heaven' means the church triumphant, a heavenly state, then as they have been declared members of that, which is only the visible church *perfected*, only a *transfer* to a heavenly state, to be with its Head; then, most certainly, they can *by right* demand the enjoyment of its privileges here, and also the application of that seal to them, which the Master has given to distinguish his fold from the world. Their parents, as their guardians in infancy, who belong to this visible church, have a right to demand this for their children. It is not only their *right* to do this for their children, but an *imperative duty*, and they are responsible to God for a faithful discharge of it."

"I do'nt see how we can question their *fitness*," said Anna, "unless we believe them '*children of wrath*,' and that they will surely be damned, if they die in infancy! But this the Baptists themselves reject as a horrid thought! If we believe them heirs of heaven until they rebel by *actual transgression*, then they are as fit subjects for baptism as you or I; and far more so, for they have not that load of guilt, those actual transgressions upon their consciences that we have. And we are not only assured that they are *fit subjects*, but Jesus said, 'Suffer them to come unto me.' And he says again: 'He that cometh unto me, I will in *no wise cast out*.' The Great Shep-

herd who 'gathers the lambs in his arms, and carries them in his bosom,' is not so heartless that he would fain *cast them out, or thrust them from the pale and privileges of his church!* George Herbert well said —

“ ‘Since, Lord, to thee
A narrow way and little gate
Is all the passage; on my infancy
Thou didst lay hold, and antedate
My faith in me.’ ”

“ And now, Mr. Halley, will you please tell us what is implied on the part of parents when they present their child for baptism ? ”

“ Before angels and men, they give up their child to God, renouncing their own claim to dispose of it; and acknowledge that it was originally God's gift, and is now laid on his altar. They offer it to God the Father as its Creator. They offer it to God the Son as its Savior and Redeemer, and who, for it, became in his incarnation a little child like unto it. And they offer it to God the Holy Ghost as its Sanctifier; of whom it is born in the Spirit, and thus fitted for the holiness of heaven. It is a solemn moment on the part of the parents when they take it from the altar. They have given it to God, and they now bear it away to bring it up for him. And whenever they look upon it thereafter their feelings are to be expressed by these words 'LENT, NOT GIVEN.' Yes, Lord —

“ ‘Our children thou dost claim,
And mark them out for thine;
Ten thousand blessings to thy name
For goodness so divine.
Thy covenant may we keep,
And bless the happy bands
Which closer still engage our hearts,
To honor thy commands.

Our offspring, still thy care,
 Shall own their father's God;
 To latest times thy blessings share,
 And sound thy praise abroad.'"

"What are the obligations which this consecration of the child imposes on the parents?" asked Anna.

"To frequently renew the dedication of the child to God. To begin early to pray *with* the child. To early teach it the nature and meaning of baptism, and its obligations to God. To always bear in mind its consecration, and their covenant vows when deciding questions of duty in governing or advising the child. And what is implied on the part of a covenant-keeping God in this ordinance cannot, perhaps, be better expressed than in the words of the celebrated Shepherd of Cambridge to his son: 'God gave thee the ordinance of baptism, whereby God is become *thy God*, and is *beforehand* with thee, so that if thou wilt return to God, he will *undoubtedly receive thee.*'"

"There is a fitness in this," said Anna, "which shows the finger-prints of Jehovah. And do you think, that if parents—all Christian parents—would thus consecrate their children, and *faithfully, religiously* perform the obligations it imposes upon them, there would be an unconverted child in the families of all such believers?"

"I answer with the most perfect assurance," replied Halley, "that *there would not be one!* For if God's people kept their part of the covenant unbroken, *God could not violate his part of it.* 'Yea, let God be true, though every man a liar.' It is because Christians take such obligations upon them thoughtlessly, or in ignorance of their nature and importance, and therefore violate almost every hour of their lives this solemn covenant; and set very inconsistent examples before their families; so that thousands of baptized children are, to-day, lifting up their eyes being in torment. But this is no reason or excuse

for not making this consecration of their children to God. It is just as much the *duty* of those who do not have their children baptized in infancy, to train them up for the Lord, as it is of those who *set out* to do the will of their Father in this respect, and endeavor to obey God herein: for God has commanded it. And if they do not appear before God with a broken covenant, they will appear before him, having broken, neglected and despised his commands. Impressions made in early life by parents upon their children are potent for good or evil, and can never be effaced.

‘Heaven lies about us in our infancy.’

“John Newton testifies that in the midst of his infidelity and debauchery, he would sometimes seem to feel the pressure of his mother’s hand upon his head, though long since dead; and when she prayed with him he was too young to understand her words, but the pressure of that hand followed him in his manhood, and was one of the means of bringing him to God. Truly,

‘The mother, in her office, holds the key
Of the soul; and she it is who stamps the coin
Of character, and makes the being, who would be a savage
But for her gentle cares, a Christian man.’”

“If we dedicate our children at home,” said Squire Tanner, “what is the use of a *public consecration* of them?”

“I will ask in reply,” said Halley, “if we dedicate ourselves to God in our closets, what is the use of a public profession of religion?”

“Why, God requires it. We must profess Christ before men; and thereby we are restrained from sin, and prompted to duty. The remembrance of our public profession acts as a monitor in the Christian life.”

“God also requires the other,” replied Halley; “and for precisely the same reason on our part. The recollection of it

will incite to greater faithfulness. Public vows have tenfold more effect upon the mind than vows made in private."

"But why make use of baptism in doing it?" asked Tanner. "Why not bring them to the house of God, and have public prayers for them without the ordinance of baptism?"

"And I ask in reply again," said Halley, "why do we use the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, when we desire particularly to remember feelingly the Lord Jesus, and to call to mind the most forcibly his death and sufferings? Why not come together, and have prayers and a sermon suitable to bring the Savior before the mind? Why you answer: there is something in the sight of the emblems, and the taking of them in our hands, which affects the mind more deeply than anything else can. By it we get a nearer, clearer view of the atonement, than in any other way. So also baptism is calculated to bring the operation of the Spirit before our minds. By it we acknowledge our need of him, our need of his aid to help us in the discharge of duty, and also his purifying influences upon the heart of the child. And further: God has taught us and commanded us to consecrate them to him, by placing upon them the seal of his covenant; and we have no right of choice in the matter. There is something in *seeing that seal* placed upon our child in the name of the Triune God, that is more impressive than many exhortations and prayers. And besides having the effect to make the parent more faithful; WE KNOW, if we fulfill our vows toward it, that it secures to the child the especial favor of God: for God has pledged his word, and he cannot lie. 'He has promised, and will he not fulfill?'

"Why did God promise Abraham, 'I will be a God to thee, and to thy seed after thee?'" God himself answers the question (Gen. xviii. 19): 'For I know him, that *he will command his children*, and his household after him, and *they shall keep the way of the Lord*, to do justice and judgment; that the Lord may bring upon Abraham, that which he hath spoken to him.'

God is under no obligation to fulfil his covenant vows, toward those who do not command their children after them, and keep the way of the Lord. But moreover, it secures to the child the prayers of the church at the time of baptism, and ever after at suitable times, in circles for prayer, till the child grown to a proper age reconsecrates himself, and sits down at the Lord's table; and God has encouragingly styled himself a 'prayer-hearing God,' and also a 'prayer-answering God.' And, lastly, it affords the child in after years, strong grounds of hope to come to God; it is a source of great encouragement at the time of conversion—or a reconsecration to God—I know it has been to me. There are times when the Spirit of God is striving with us; when anything that can keep the soul from despair, and quicken faith, is of great importance. At such times, the recollections of a parent's faith and prayers, and the united prayers of God's people, will encourage and lead a despairing soul to look up and plead with *effect*: O God! was I not cast upon thee when a child? Remember thou, O Lord, thy covenant, for art thou not a covenant-keeping God? I confess my waywardness and rebellion, and would now return in penitent submission unto thee, who art the God of my fathers, and didst covenant to be *my God*, till by my transgression I rejected thee; yet now with penitential sorrow and tears would I come to thee, and beseech thee not to cast me off in thine anger.

“Some persons think that baptism is a profession of religion, and for this reason, they must be baptized when they make a profession. This is a mistaken idea. Baptism is not *our* profession to God, but God's profession to us. It is his seal, the seal of his covenant, placed upon us. It is a common error, that the baptism of children makes them members of the church. This is not true. The children of believing parents are *born* members, and baptism is but a *recognition* of that right of membership. Their membership is not founded on their baptism, but their baptism on their membership. God or-

dained that any infant which should not be circumcised, '*that soul should be cut off from his people,*' because, it is added, '*he hath broken my vow.*' Here it is manifest that the soul cut off in consequence of non-circumcision, must previously, and independent of circumcision, have belonged to God's people—must have been a subject of the covenant, and member of God's church; or else, how could he be cut off, or be said to have broken his vow? Hence, circumcision was but the recognition of that membership. So children of Christian parents are members of God's visible church in virtue of his election of them through Christ, to be partakers of his covenant of *Grace*, and baptism is the seal of that covenant—the vow of fidelity to it, and of course a public recognition of their membership. This view is also supported by the proper rendering of 1 Cor. vii. 14, 'Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy;' that is, now held as members of the Christian church."

"I rather think you will find that untenable ground," said Tanner, hastily turning the leaves of his book. "Let me read a little to you of what Mr. Graves says on p. 216: 'The Jews, as we learn from Ezra x. 3, were not permitted to continue in the marriage relation with their Gentile wives. Now the question had come up in the Corinthian church, whether a *Christian* should not, under a similar regulation, separate from an unbelieving and idolatrous companion. But if such unbelieving consorts were by the other's faith entitled to church membership, and had, consequently, been baptized, such a thing as separation on this ground would never have been thought of. It is evident, therefore, that the infidel husband or the infidel wife were not baptized, or made church members. There is in the Scriptures not the slightest allusion to any such church members made by the faith of others, and not by their own. These persons were, therefore, in every sense, outsiders. They had no more connection with the church than any other hea-

thens had. But the Apostle says to their Christian companions, You have no more reason to discard their children, for they are also unbelievers, and without the pale of the church. The unbelieving husband and the unbelieving wife, and your children, not their children, stand in the same category. They are all without the church—all unbaptized—and thus far, all equally unfit associates. But as your children, though not in the church, are holy to you, that is, fit to associate with, so is the unbelieving husband or the unbelieving wife, although they are also out of the church. * * * And if the children of believing parents were unbaptized, it was a Baptist church; and if the church at Corinth was a Baptist church, then all the churches planted by the Apostles were Baptist churches.' Now, Mr. Halley, that is what I call a perfect demonstration! I think you may as well resign *that* text, at least."

Halley smiled half unconsciously, and said that by and by that could better be determined upon; he then turned to the passage in his Greek Testament, and hastily glanced it over. Every eye was resting on him during this interval of a very few moments of silence. Looking up from his Greek text, and turning toward Squire Tanner with a clear, steady, and earnest gaze, he said: "In the first place, permit me to assure your text-book, that we do not claim that an unbelieving husband or wife is entitled to baptism on the faith of his or her partner; nor is that, by any means, a sequence from our premises."

"I think you speak rather contemptuously," said Squire Tanner, with an offended air.

"Not at all, sir," said Halley; "but as all present might not understand the connection between Mr. J. R. Graves, the editor of the 'Tennessee Baptist,' and that fatherless volume you hold in your hand, I thought I would speak so as to be understood. If you prefer it, then, permit me to assure Mr. Graves, and through Mr. Graves permit me to assure you, that that is not a deduction from our premises. Our position is that God's cove-

nant is with his believing people and *their children*. And if either parent is a believer, then, through the faith of that parent, the children are entitled to covenant privileges. His mixing in something about the infidel wife and the infidel husband being church members on the faith of the other, *is done merely for effect* upon those who might not have discernment enough to discover the sophistry of his argument, and it is altogether irrelevant to the point in question.

“We claim that we are taught here in this text by the Apostle Paul, that by the faith of one parent the children are made holy in that sense which entitles them to the privileges of the church. Calvin, Wahl, Whitby, Knapp, Doederlein, Doddridge, Schleusner, and many others, render this passage thus. Schleusner says, ‘He is called holy who is to be numbered with the society of Christians.’ Wahl says, ‘It is spoken of one who is in any way connected with Christians, and therefore to be reckoned among them.’ Dr. Doddridge says—and with him agree the great mass of the most learned and distinguished commentators, as well as the great mass of the Christian world—‘On the maturest and the most impartial consideration of this text, I must refer it to infant baptism.’ And indeed, this is the natural interpretation of the passage; and the most rigid scrutiny of the original language not only bears out this rendering, but condemns every other which has been advanced. So strongly does the natural interpretation prove infant baptism, that its opposers have felt that there was no relief but *to set aside* the proper interpretation. The famous Baptist commentator Dr. Gill, *supposes* the Apostle to mean, ‘Else were your children illegitimate, but now are they legitimate.’ The absurdities of this gloss are many and palpable. I will mention but few. The Greek words, which he renders here ‘illegitimate’ and ‘legitimate,’ have no such meaning anywhere else in the Bible, or anywhere in classic Greek; it is never used in this sense by any Greek author, sacred or profane; and there-

fore is of course a sheer fabrication of Dr. Gill. The word ἀκαθάρτα (*akatharta*), which he renders 'illegitimate,' means *unclean* or *common*, and has its usual signification in Acts x. 14, where it is used by Peter. So also ἁγία (*hagia*), which he renders 'legitimate,' means *holy, set apart, consecrated*, as in Luke ii. 23, where the same word is used. See also Ex. xiii. 12. Also, the idea that piety in one party is necessary to render a marriage contract valid, is so ridiculous, that not a word need be said to refute it; it is its own confutation!

"It is objected by Mr. Graves, that if the children being called *holy* makes them members of church, then the unbelieving husband and wife, being said to be sanctified (the original word is ἡγιασται (*hegiasti*), which means to be regarded, *not as unclean—not as an idolator, but as belonging to the Christian community*), would make them church members also, and entitle them to baptism all around. Splendid reasoning this! It is just like that he treats his readers to all along. For instance, he says, repentance and faith are required of *adults* in order to baptism; but *infants* cannot have these, and therefore are not fit subjects for baptism. There is no logical connection here at all. He has confounded the two distinct classes, *infants* and *adults*. We reason: The Scriptures require repentance and faith of adults in order to baptism, but some adults have no repentance and faith, and therefore some adults are not to be baptized. We put no more in the conclusion than can be inferred from the premises. Your conclusion must not be overdrawn from the premises, or have different terms than are properly *predicated* in your premises; or else your reasoning becomes no reasoning—only a specious argument to the undiscerning—a sophism merely. This is the kind of reasoning your author, Squire Tanner, indulges in very freely; for he has learned that by putting one thing in the premises, and another entirely different in the conclusion, he can thereby assert any absurdity, however glaring; and it is in this way that he has

raised such specious objections to infant baptism, to palm off upon the ignorant.

“Now in that same passage of Scripture before referred to, where faith and repentance are required of adults in order to salvation, Mr. Graves’ reasoning must inevitably lead to this, that infants cannot have these, therefore infants cannot be saved. Paul says: ‘If any one (meaning adults of course, and those *able* to work), will not work, neither shall he eat.’ Mr. Graves would add, Infants cannot work, and therefore they shall not eat. Says Paul, ‘Circumcision verily profiteth if thou keep the law’ (referring to those, certainly, who *can* keep the law). Says Brother Graves, Infants cannot keep the law, therefore their circumcision *is unprofitable*. But says Paul, ‘If thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision.’ Brother Graves would say, Infants cannot break the law, therefore their circumcision is not made uncircumcision — that is, *it is profitable*. Christ says, ‘He that believeth and is baptized (referring only to those who are *able* to believe), shall be saved.’ Brother Graves would respond, Infants cannot believe, therefore *they shall NOT be saved*, if he still reasoned as usual; but no, that does not subserve his purpose, and so he says, *shall not be baptized*; which in fact is only another variation which he is very familiar with, and falls under the same general class. And in this case, his argument is; if children being called holy, entitles them to baptism, then adults being called sanctified, entitles them also to baptism; which, like the others we have been considering, is a pure sophism, and proves nothing! Its fallacy lies in the idea, that the effect produced on the unbelieving husband or wife by alliance with the believing, is precisely the same with the holiness which children derive from their descent from believing parents. But the supposition is altogether without foundation — it is unwarranted. We grant that the unbelieving wife or husband is not to be called unclean or an idolator, for the word

of God says so, but he is not to be regarded in that sense, which shall entitle him to church membership, for there are no such conditions in God's covenant; and therefore it would be a violation of it. But the membership of infants would be no violation of it, provided one of their parents be numbered with the people of God. In view of the covenant and this exposition of Paul, it would be but a natural and necessary corollary. In accordance with the terms of the covenant, church-membership was the *birthright* of the children of God's people; but in no case was it allowed on the mere fact of intermarriage. Paul in this argument assumes that the children of believers are holy and clean. But was that true? Ask the Bible reader, if it was true in accordance with the meaning the Jews gave the term? The answer is in the affirmative. The Jews were called a 'holy people.' Why? Because they were separated from the Gentile world, who were considered unclean, and directly in covenant with God. The word 'holy,' in its general sense, meant set apart, consecrated; and *it and unclean* were ever converse terms. They were used not only to distinguish Jews from Gentiles, but also anything which was set apart from a common to a religious use. In this sense, the Sabbath-day is called holy, likewise the vessels of the temple, the vestments of the high-priests, etc. Thus it follows that the children of the Jews were considered by the Jews as holy, and the children of the Gentiles as unclean. This understanding of terms actually existed in the minds of the Jews; and Paul assumes this, and then reasons that the believing husband need not put away his unbelieving wife; for, as paraphrased by Dr. Woods, 'The children are holy in the sense intended, in consequence of the influence which the believing wife has upon the unbelieving husband, or the believing husband upon the unbelieving wife. He is sanctified by her, and she by him; and *in consequence of their sanctification*, whatever it is, the children are *holy*. Without this sanctification of the unbelieving by the believing, the

children would be *unclean*. Suppose now husband and wife are both unbelievers. The sanctification spoken of, whatever it is, does not exist; of course, the reason or cause of the holiness of the children does not exist—they cannot be holy—they are unclean.’ When both parents were believers, the children belonged to the church as a matter of course; but now when *one* only was a believer, they could not decide, and so they submitted the case to Paul, and he assured them that God would reckon the children to the *believing* parent, and not to the unbelieving. It is enough that they are yours. The infidelity of your partner shall never frustrate their interest in the covenant of your God. They are *holy* because you are holy.

“But in this investigation, Squire Tanner, we have not found that the children of believers, at Corinth, were unbaptized. And it is too bad, on account of the glittering air-bubble your author erected on that supposition. I cannot refrain from holding it up for our contemplation a moment, ere it vanishes into air. Turn, if you please, to page 218, and see his statement: ‘If the children of Corinth were unbaptized, it was a Baptist church; and if the church at Corinth was a Baptist church, then all the churches planted by the Apostles were Baptist churches.’ That I think is the substance of the statement; and here we have truly a beautiful little edifice—spire, dome, walls, and columns—very beautiful for Baptist eyes to gaze upon, and all hung upon a convenient little ‘IF.’ Turn it around and gaze upon it! O, if that little ‘IF’ was not so precarious a support! What if it should pull out, and let all down in a crash at our feet! Suppose, now, I hang up a ‘*water-fowl*’ on the same loop! I will capture it by the same process of reasoning employed by Brother Graves in discovering his Baptist churches, and I desire you to look first upon the one and then upon the other; and no doubt you will wonder and admire! If a turtle swims, it is a ‘*water-fowl*,’ and if it is a ‘*water-fowl*,’ then ALL BIRDS are ‘*water-fowls*!’”

“In addition to what has already been adduced, we learn, by an examination of the New Testament in the original Greek, that most of the terms applied to believers, were also applied to their children. They used the most affectionate appellations; such as brother, sister, the called, the elect, holy persons or saints, the faithful, etc. These, however, were given to none but church members. The one most frequently and extensively given to church members was, ‘the faithful.’ This remained their title for several centuries. It was used in the singular and also in the plural. The mother of Timothy is called *a faithful*—πιστῆς (*pistēs*). Also when Lydia was baptized, she said, ‘If ye have judged me to be faithful’ a faithful (πιστήν): the same word is used (see Acts xvi. 1–15). This is the feminine form of the word; the masculine form is πιστός and πιστόν (*pistos* and *piston*). In 1 Cor. iv. 17, Timothy is called the ‘faithful’ in the Lord (πιστόν). In Eph. i. 1, Paul sends greeting to the ‘faithfuls’ (πιστοῖς), in Christ at Ephesus. It is also used in the plural in Acts x. 45, which in the original reads: ‘And they were astonished, those of the circumcision, ‘the faithfuls’ as many as came with Peter, etc.’

“There are a great many examples all through the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles. It is addressed to churches as communities: as in Eph. i. 1, Col. i. 2, etc. From this it is evident that to call an individual ‘*a faithful*’ in that age, was equivalent to saying that he was a Christian brother, or a disciple of Jesus Christ, or in other words a church member. Now if this same title was given to children, they were distinctly recognized as members of Christ’s church.

“Paul, in describing the character of a bishop, represents him as being ‘the husband of one wife and having children, WHICH ARE FAITHFULS.’ The original is τέκνα ἔχων πιστὰ (*tekna echōn pista*), which literally translated is, ‘having children, the faithfuls,’ or ‘having faithful children’ (See Titus i. 6). The Greek word τέκνον (*teknon*, a child) and τέκνα (*tekna*,

children), say Drs. Gregory, Robinson, and other distinguished Baptist writers, means 'minors from twenty days old to twenty years.' I may add that this Greek word is used in the same sense as we use the word 'child.' Hence we may learn that the membership of children is a necessary qualification — that is, ALL the children the person may have, whether in the tenderest infancy or more advanced — for the office of bishop. And the bishop was to be a model, an exemplar, to the church. It was, then, not only required of the clergy, as a *Christian duty* to see that all their children were consecrated to God as members of his visible church, and thereby become '*faithfuls*;' but also as a Christian duty it was required of all true believers. A neglect of this duty disqualified them for prominent places in the church, as thereby they evinced a defective Christian character, and were not worthy of imitation. They were required to have their children constituted '*faithfuls*' *irrespective of age*: none were too young. In harmony with these facts, we read that Paul sent his salutations to Priscilla and Aquila, and *to the church in their family* (See Rom. xvi. 3 and 5). Also to Nymphas and to the church in his family (Col. iv. 15). Also to Philemon and to the church in his family (Philemon 2).

“Now the illustrious church fathers and writers, as Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, and more recently Grotius, and also all the Greek scholiasts, maintain that the families of these individuals *were all made faithfuls*, and in such a manner as to be called churches. And we might bring forward other evidences—other terms which were applied to children as well as to adult church members; but we have said enough on this point. If any one will be convinced by the *truth* at all, sufficient evidence has already been adduced to show that our statements are correct. I will now only add a few inscriptions, marking the last resting-place of some of those who immediately succeeded the apostles. George, can you tell me what the Catacombs of Rome are?”

“It is supposed,” answered George, “that excavations, for building-stone, were commenced near Rome long before the age assigned to Romulus and Remus, and therefore long before the Eternal City was founded. A mighty people inhabited this district of Italy long before the Romans, and built those massive Etruscan tombs, and the temples in Pæstum, which, two thousand years ago, the Romans were accustomed to visit as antiquities. These ancient quarries, subterranean quarries, abound in the south of Italy, at Rome and Naples; and also are traced in Sicily, in Greece, in Asia Minor, and in nearly all the Greek islands. Those at Rome are very extensive. They are a network of excavations, and extend to the distance of fifteen miles, and some say even twenty. They are a perfect labyrinth. Cicero speaks of them in his oration for Cluentius. In these caverns, also, Suetonius tells us, Nero was advised to conceal himself in his hour of danger; but he replied that ‘he would not go under the ground while living.’ Before and after the time of Nero, these catacombs were inhabited by those condemned to work there; and also afforded a safe place of retreat in times of disaster and persecution.”

“What connection have they with the early Christians and the primitive church?” asked Halley.

“They were their dwelling-places and their cemetery,” replied George. “Father Bosio was the first modern writer who turned his attention to them. He spent more than thirty years (1567 to 1600) in exploring them, penetrating into some of the innermost crypts which had been closed for centuries, and making drawings of the inscriptions. Father Boldetti also spent more than thirty years in the examination of the tombs and crypts prior to 1720. M. D’Agincourt, an ardent student of Christian archæology, settled in Rome near the close of the last century, intending to stay six months, but remained fifty years solely occupied in these investigations. In 1846, a work appeared in England entitled ‘The Church in the Catacombs,’

by Charles Maitland, M. D., and also in this country, in 1854, a small work called the 'Catacombs of Rome,' by Rev. William I. Kip, D. D.

"By these investigations it is shown that the catacombs were, throughout, well known to the early Christians; for all parts of them bear trace of their occupancy. Says Dr. Kip: 'For three hundred years the entire Christian population of Rome found sepulture in these recesses.' Chrysostom and Prudentius speak of them as the dwelling-places of the Christians during the persecutions in the first age of the Christian church. Jerome, in the middle of the fourth century (about 350), speaks of visiting them whilst a youth at Rome. He called them 'the Sepulchres of the Apostles and Martyrs.' After the persecutions, in the reign of Constantine (after 306), three centuries having passed by, Christianity emerging from these dark recesses, walked boldly on the surface of the earth, beneath which she had so long been glad to seek concealment. Here in these dens and caves of the earth, for two hundred years (from the death of the Apostles), was probably the most perfect representation of the Apostolic church. Here were the doctrines and teachings of the Apostles preserved in their primitive simpleness and purity. At least, so say they who have made this subject a life-study, and who understand it the best."

"Very well, then," said Halley, "if there is any practice or doctrine to be learned from their relics and their inscriptions, we may be pretty well assured that it is Apostolic in its nature and character. Persecutions have a tendency to purify a church, and to keep it pure; and we know that during its whole history in these retreats it was in the midst of the most violent persecutions. We find these early inscriptions rude and characterized by the utmost simplicity. We here find numerous epitaphs of children, who are called '*faithfuls*' and '*neophytes*,' titles which could not have been bestowed upon them unless

they had been received by baptism into the Christian church. The age at which they died, of course, precludes the idea of that rite having been administered to them in any way but as infants. I will read some of these inscriptions and epitaphs from some of the works which George has referred to on this subject.

“1. ‘To Romanus, the well-deserving neophyte, who lived eight years.’ 2. ‘Flavia Jovina, who lived three years and thirty days, a neophyte. In peace (she died) the eleventh kalends.’ 3. ‘The tile of Candidus, the neophyte, who lived twenty-one months, buried on the nones of September.’ 4. ‘A faithful descended from ancestors who were faithfuls. Here lies Zosimus; he lived two years, one month, and twenty-five days.’ This inscription bore the symbol of the fish and the anchor, which mark the period of a primitive, suffering Christianity—probably the first century after the Apostles. 5. ‘Cyriacus, a faithful, died aged eight days less than three years.’ 7. ‘Urica Florentina, a faithful, rests here in peace. She lived five years, eight months, and eight days.’ 8. ‘Maurentius, son of Maurentia, a most pleasing child, who lived five years, eleven months, and two days, worthy to repose in peace among holy persons.’ 9. ‘Sacred to the Great God. Leopardus rests here in peace with holy spirits; having received baptism, he went to the blessed innocents. This was placed by his parents, with whom he lived seven years and seven months.’ 10. ‘Buffilla, newly baptized, who lived two years and forty days.’ 11. ‘To Domitius, an innocent newly baptized, who lived three years and thirty days.’ There are many others which might be added to this list, but it is not necessary.

“Now, Squire Tanner, please look at the charges made by your author on pp. 299, 302, 304, and 309; and consider the spirit—the bitterness of feeling—in which they are made. He says that infant baptism is ‘*a heinous sin,*’ ‘*an act of daring rebellion against God,*’ ‘*a continually repeated falsehood,*’ ‘high-

handed rebellion against the Son of God,' 'impious,' 'an act of impious sacrilege!' Remember that these charges were made by a man — professedly a Christian man, and a minister of the everlasting Gospel — with the word of God in his hand! Remember that he was denouncing, by virtue of his office, in the name of God, an institution of God's own appointment, and to which he has affixed his seal! Remember that God created the relation of children to parents, and also the relation of children to his church, and made special mention of them in his covenant with his people, and comprehended them in all his promises; and declared again and again that this relation should be unending, his covenant should be *everlasting*; and yet this man, without showing *one* annulling or repealing clause of this covenant in all God's word, but with *many* confirmations of it staring him in the face; without one passage in the whole Bible in any way reflecting upon the consecration of children to God, and upon the giving to them the seal of this covenant, as he directed should be done; with the words of Christ before him, 'that his kingdom belongs to them;' and also in the face of all the testimony of the early Christians, which has been preserved in various ways to us — an unbroken chain from the Apostles down; in the very face and teeth of all these evidences, he utters such charges as those I have mentioned! The charges themselves are '*impious*;' ay, more! But as he is dealing with God's institutions, and not man's, let God here, and not us, be his Judge!"

A few moments of impressive silence followed, which was first broken by Anna's slowly and thoughtfully asking, "What do you say of the household baptisms mentioned in the New Testament, Mr. Halley?"

"I say they are strong corroborative testimony of our position," answered Halley. "Granting that infant or household baptism was a common practice, it is thought by some an objection that there are so few cases mentioned. But this arises

entirely from a superficial view of the matter. Indeed, I have heard it urged by some people, that there are but *three* such cases recorded in the New Testament—those of Lydia, the jailor, and Stephanas. But I think a careful examination will afford more than these :

“1. Acts x. 1–48, is an account of the baptism of the household of Cornelius.

“2. Acts xvi. 15, of the family of Lydia.

“3. Acts xvi. 33, of the jailor.

“4. I. Cor. i. 16, the household of Stephanas. All these are expressly mentioned as baptized; and the language used indicates that they were of frequent occurrence. The case of Lydia, for instance: ‘And when she was baptized and her household, she besought us,’ etc. It is recorded as a common and familiar event, and as the direct consequence of her own faith and profession, as the mother of the family. There can be no doubt that hundreds of families, embracing perhaps thousands of children, were baptized on the heads of them having become converted to the Christian faith. But we were searching for the believing families on record in the apostolic age.

“5. Rom. xvi. 3–5, the family of Aquila and Priscilla.

“6. Col. iv. 15, that of Nymphos.

“7. Philemon 2, is that of Philemon.

“8. Acts xviii. 8, that of Crispus.

“9. II. Timothy i. 16–18, that of Onesiphorus.

“10. Rom. xvi. 10, that of Aristobulus.

“11. Rom. xvi. 11, that of Narcissus. Now here are *eleven believing families* expressly mentioned, and of course have all received Christian baptism, be they infants or adults. Those capable of believing, doubtless believed. Says Dr. Kurtz, and a similar statement is made by Lyman Coleman: ‘Have we eleven instances of the administration of the Lord’s Supper?—not a fourth of that number. Have we eleven instances of the change of the Jewish Sabbath?—not a fifth of that number.

In fact, there is not a single doctrine, principle, or practice derived from the example of the Apostles, which can be supported by a more numerous series of clear and decided precedents.' He further says, after a critical examination of the Greek term *οἶκος* (*oikos*), which corresponds with *house* or *family* in English, and also of *οἰκία* (*oikia*), corresponding with our idea of *household*: 'Strictly speaking, there is not a single instance on inspired record of the baptism of an entire household as such; though individuals comprising it may have been baptized as individuals. We are therefore narrowed down in this investigation to the Greek term *οἶκος*, in the sense of family; and with this word it perfectly corresponds, and should have always been so rendered when used in relation to family baptism. Such a translation would have prevented all error on the subject of infant baptism. There can, correctly speaking, be no family without children. A man and his wife do not constitute a family, any more than a single gentleman who dwells under the same roof with his maiden sister.'

"Let us now keep this in mind as we glance hastily over the family baptisms spoken of in the New Testament. When the Apostle says (Acts xvi. 31), 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved and thy house,' he uses the word *οἶκος*, which means only *his own* family — children only. But in the next verse (Acts xvi. 32), 'And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his *house*;' here *οἰκία* (*oikia*) is used, and *οἶκος* (*oikos*) is dropped. The substitution of *οἰκία* in the place of *οἶκος*, shows that the Apostle intended to make a distinction between those who heard and those who were baptized. The word used signifies *household*; that is, servants, domestics, prisoners — all who were living in the house. It adds, 'And was baptized, he and all *his*;' namely, his children; and there is no evidence that any others were baptized at the time

"In Acts xvi. 15, the baptism of Lydia is recorded. Although it is rendered, 'when she was baptized and her

household,' the Greek word *oikos* is used, which limits it to children, and it should have been so rendered. Says Dr. Kurtz: 'It is a remarkable fact, that the very best of all versions, namely, the Syriac, which was probably of the first century, reads, that "when she (Lydia) was baptized WITH HER CHILDREN," etc. The Coptic version gives the same reading of this passage.' It has frequently been objected that her household consisted of those brethren spoken of in the 40th verse, who were comforted by Paul and Silas. But the original tongue is not household, but *family*, and limits the meaning to children; hence the objection is not a valid one. It has also been urged by our brother Baptists, that Lydia was a widow lady, or an old maid (any way to avoid the probability of a family of children), and that her household consisted of partners in her mercantile operations. But this objection the Rev. Mr. Slicer has answered so perfectly and satisfactorily, that I cannot refrain from repeating his words. 'They will suppose,' says he, 'that even partners in business with Lydia, or journey-men dyers, were baptized and constituted brethren; although there is no intimation that she had so much as *one* partner, or *one* journeyman; and if she had (which we think very unlikely), then they were baptized and made brethren without grace; for the passage makes no mention of the heart of any person being opened except Lydia's; and there is no intimation that these journeymen either repented or believed, and of course could not have received a believer's baptism. I appeal to you, reader, to judge who would be the most fit for baptism, the children of a believing mother, or a household of *graceless journeymen dyers!*' But again I repeat the Greek term is not household but *family*, and that cuts off all 'partners in business and journeymen dyers.' She was baptized and her family, that is, her children.

"Similar objections are urged by our Baptist friends to the other family baptisms. They insist that there was not *one*

infant or young child in all these families of children. How do they know? Is it at all probable? How many entire families have they on their church records, parents and children, received at one and the same time and baptized on profession of faith? I venture to affirm that they have *not one!* Was it ever known that under the ministrations of a Baptist brother, parents of families were hopefully converted, and were baptized, they and all theirs, straightway? There is no risk in asserting that a *family baptism* never occurred under the labors of a Baptist minister. Says Dr. Wardlaw, 'It is a remarkable fact that we have no mention of anything resembling the baptism of households, of families, in the accounts of the propagation of the Gospel by our Baptist brethren. That the Apostles baptized families, no believer of Scripture can doubt, and we have seen that the manner in which such baptisms are recorded, or referred to, indicates no extraordinary thing. Now it surely *is* an extraordinary thing that in the journals and periodical accounts of Baptist missions in heathen countries, we should never meet with anything of the kind. I question whether in the thirty years of the history of the Baptist missions in India, there is to be found a single instance of the baptism of a household. When do we find a Baptist missionary saying, 'When she was baptized and her family;' or 'I baptized the family of Krishnoo,' or any other convert? We have the baptism of individuals, but nothing corresponding to the apostolic baptism of families. This fact is a strong corroborative proof, that there is some difference between their practice and that of the Apostles. If the practice of both were the same, there might surely be expected *some little* correspondence in the facts connected with it' (See Dissertation on Infant Baptism, p. 109).

"Here is another little volume (LAW OF BAPTISM, by Rev. Edwin Hall, p. 167) from which I would like to read a passage. He says: 'The Sabbath was instituted at the creation, and

though weeks are mentioned in the sacred history, the Sabbath is not again mentioned till Moses. Yet how important the Sabbath was considered in the sight of God, is well known. Again it is not mentioned from the time of Joshua till the reign of David; and yet (as says Dr. Humphrey) "It will be admitted, that beyond all doubt, the pious judges of Israel remembered the Sabbath-day to keep it holy." Moreover the Bible says nothing of circumcision from a little after Moses till the days of Jeremiah, a period of eight hundred years; yet, doubtless, circumcision was practised all the time. In like manner our *Missionary Herald*, each volume of which is *twenty times* as large as the book of Acts, is now in the progress of the thirty-sixth volume (1840). In the whole of these, containing the journals of so many missionaries, narrating every important incident with so much minuteness, and continued for so many years, there are very few instances mentioned of Infant Baptism. I have not the means at hand of ascertaining how many, but though I have been familiar a long time with them, and have long observed the fact with some curiosity, and have especially examined not a little, I am not able to find, or to call to mind, more than a very few instances previously to the last two years. But we know the missionaries of the American Board are all Pedobaptists. The paucity of these records of infant baptism in their letters, does not prove that they do not baptize infants; we know they do, and once in a while the fact is mentioned; but it is rare, though their converts amount to many thousands. Suppose now, that, at the present time, you find a pamphlet of some twenty or thirty pages, like a single monthly number of the *Missionary Herald*, only half as large, covering the ground of some fifty years, and giving an account of the doings of some missionaries of whom you have never heard before. The question is asked, are they Baptist missionaries, or do they baptize the infant children of believing parents? On examining the pamphlet, we find such records as these: "At

such a time I baptized, in the night, a jailor and all his." At such a time "Lydia and her household." At such a time "I baptized also the household of Stephanas:" nothing is said as to whether they were all adults, or whether, as is more common, there were children in these households. Only this is certain, that if there were children, they were certainly baptized. Suppose further, that at this crisis we discover copious letters of these missionaries, written to these converts from heathenism, in which they use the term household just as we do the word family. Are they Baptist missionaries? The presumption is they are not. You find a difficulty that must be removed before you can believe that they are Baptists. Moreover you take the journals of the Baptist missionaries of fifty or a hundred times the size of this newly-discovered pamphlet, and a hundred times more full. You do not learn that they *ever* give an account of the baptism of a SINGLE HOUSEHOLD, though you can understand how desirable it would be to make such a record as frequent in their journals as possible; and how readily they would be brought forward in argument as often as they might occur. You make another discovery, viz.: that these unknown missionaries consider the Abrahamic and Christian church the same. Now let one passage be found in a single letter of theirs to one of their churches, gathered from heathenism, to this effect: "The unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband, and the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, else were your children unclean but now are they holy;" let it be proved that they familiarly use these terms in the Jewish sense—let but one such passage as this be found, and the question is settled, *they baptize children*. Who could ask for more convincing proof, unless he is determined that nothing shall prove it, save an *express* declaration in so many words—or a miracle? I might appeal to any man accustomed to sifting and weighing evidence in our courts of justice, Is not this valid proof of the fact? Were it a question of fact to be decided by mere im-

partial jurors in our courts of law, whether these missionaries practised infant baptism, could there be a doubt how, on this evidence, the question would be decided? Could there be a doubt that the verdict would be THESE MEN BELIEVED IN INFANT BAPTISM AND PRACTISED IT?' The case is submitted to you," said Halley, as he closed the little volume he had been reading from. "Is not the evidence convincing—so conclusive that it does not admit of a shadow of doubt?"

"O, yes!" said Tanner, hitching uneasily in his chair; "*circumstantial evidence*, and very good of its kind; but still it is not *positive testimony*! I like *positive testimony*. If one of the Apostles had only jotted down, that at such a time, I baptized an infant belonging to such a one, why there would then be no doubt in the matter—no getting around that."

"Do you, Squire Tanner, *act upon positive testimony* in your transactions of business? Is your Christian faith founded upon *positive testimony*? Is there no possibility of a doubt coming, in all you do, and in all you believe? Has God seen fit to give *positive evidence* to free moral and intelligent beings, to guide them in their duty toward him and to their fellow-men? If such was the case, would this be a proper state of discipline and moral training? In all you do, sir, in every department of life, you act upon probabilities only! Your whole life and its various transactions, and all your doubts and beliefs, are grounded upon probable or circumstantial testimony. Are you to prescribe to God how he shall govern his moral universe? Will you tell the Most High that because he has not given you *positive evidence* of his being and attributes, therefore you will not believe that he is; but will thrust him out of his own realm? Ought we not to be satisfied with *whatever kind* of evidence God may see proper to give us? If it is *convincing*, and has the weight of probabilities in its favor, what more can we ask? What more should reasonable and intelligent creatures desire? But, sir, if you act upon positive evidence,

point me to a single example of the baptism of *an adult born of Christian parents*, and I will point you to scores of examples of infant baptism! Do you accept the challenge? It is a fair one. If the *children of believers* did not receive baptism in infancy, they must have received it when converted, or they remained without it. But where do we find on inspired record a solitary example of an individual, born of Christian parents, who was baptized as a believing adult? What was his name? Who were his parents? Now this is *very remarkable*, when we remember that the New Testament embraces a period of more than *sixty years*, and there were at least two or three generations of children during this time. What became of these thousands of children, if they were not baptized in infancy? Did they all die infidels? No — by no means! We read of some of them *believing*; but when were they baptized? Answer *my* question, and I will answer *yours*, and with *positive* proofs as you desire. From this *silence* of the inspired word on this subject, I could raise as strong an argument against the baptism of *adult children of believers*, on profession of their faith, as you do against the baptism of *infant children of believers*, who are not capable of exercising faith. The reasoning would be exactly the same. Demanding *positive* testimony on this subject, I could maintain that the word of God gives no authority for the baptism of *adult* persons born of *Christian parents*; neither precept nor example. But only such as were converted from the Jews, Greeks, or Romans, were to be baptized; and you would search the record in vain for anything to the contrary, unless you claim, as we do, that children of Christian parents are *born members* of the church, and included in God's *everlasting covenant*, and thereby entitled to the seal — the Christian seal — of that covenant in infancy."

"That strikes me with peculiar force," said Anna. "And I see no reason why we should not believe that children of Christian parents were considered as belonging to the church, and

enjoying its privileges, and consequently baptized in infancy, until some objector can discover as much as *one* instance in the Bible where they received baptism as adults. Nothing more is needed to satisfy my mind on this subject; yet if it could be shown that infant baptism was practised by the *primitive church*, and ever since that time, it certainly would be desirable to do so; and if this could be done, I would like to know where the Baptists rest their faith, and what foundation they have to build upon! We have already seen that anti-pedobaptists have no Bible authority in their favor; nothing in the word of God whereon to found their objections and to build their faith. I anticipate that Church History will be an interesting part of the subject; and does it not come next in order, Mr. Halley?"

"It does," replied Halley; "and to-morrow, if there is no objection, we will meet here again, and examine into the history of the church a little — learn how far back the Baptist church can date its origin, and endeavor to determine whether infant baptism or 'infant sprinkling,'—as your author calls it,—is, or is not, a 'corruption of the church of Rome.'"

CHAPTER XI.

"The ocean hath its chart, the stars their map,
 And knowledge spreads them on her ample lap;
 But Rome is as the desert, where we steer
 Stumbling o'er recollections. Ruins of years!
 Amidst this wreck, where time has made a shrine
 And temple more divinely desolate,
 Among thy mightier offerings, here are mine.
 Oh time! the beautifier of the dead,
 Adorner of the ruin, comforter,
 And only healer when the heart hath bled.
 Time! the corrector where our judgments err,
 The test of truth, love, — sole philosopher,
 For all beside are sophists, from thy thrift,
 Which never loses though it doth defer—
 Time, the avenger! unto thee I lift
 My hands, and eyes, and heart, and crave of thee a GIFT."

"Lord, thou hast been our dwelling-place in all generations."

HALLEY and George, early on the morning of the next day, jumped into a carriage and drove hastily over to P——, where a friend of Halley's resided — a gentleman whose abundant wealth had afforded him the means of cultivating his literary tastes in extensive research among men in different countries. He had travelled much, and had gathered a large library of *ancient* literature as well as modern. Halley's object was to make a selection from his library of desirable works to present as authority in the pending controversy. His friend readily furnished him with the books he was in quest of.

When Halley, after their return, entered Elder Clayton's

study, with his arms full of ancient-looking volumes, he found the room closely crowded. As he laid his books upon the table, Squire Tanner arose and introduced to him Elder Mason — a prominent man among the Baptist clergy in that vicinity. After the usual compliments had passed around, Halley brought forward the subject of discussion for the day, by requesting Squire Tanner to turn to the 324th page of the volume he had, and read the statement there made as to the first instance on record of the baptism of a child.

Squire Tanner read: "There is not on record a single solitary instance of the baptism of *a child*, till the year of our Lord three hundred and seventy, and that was the son of the Emperor Valens."

"Very well," said Halley. "Now please to turn to page 341, and read his authority for stating that infant baptism was not ordained by Christ and the Apostles."

Squire Tanner again read: "The men who say that it is *certain* that infant baptism was not ordained by Christ or the Apostles, and was not introduced until after the second century, are such men as Neander, Coleman, and Kitto, among the most learned and eminent of *your own ecclesiastical historians, and Biblical critics.*"

"We are grateful for his tribute to their learning and eminence; and we suppose, of course, he considered them competent witnesses, or he would not have used their names," said Halley. "But unfortunately for Mr. Graves' statement, I happen to have ANCIENT CHRISTIANITY EXEMPLIFIED, by Lyman Coleman, here, and I will read a passage or two from it, and see if he states that 'infant baptism was not introduced till after the second century.' On pages 374 and 375, 'The silence of *early* historical records (he means those which would be contemporaneous with the Evangelist John, and immediately after his death), respecting infant baptism, is no valid argument against it. * * Christian baptism has from the beginning

been characterized for the *universality* of its application. Proselyte baptism was administered only to pagan nations. John's baptism was restricted solely to the Jews; but Christian baptism *is open to all*. Proselyte baptism included the children with the parents; John's baptism excluded both children and the female sex. Christian baptism excludes no nation, or sex, or AGE. Comp. Matt. xxviii. 19-20; Gal. iii. 28; 1 Cor. xii. 13; together with the authorities of Irenæus, Cyprian, and Tertullian, quoted below. From all which, it appears *evident beyond a doubt, that the ancient church understood that Christian baptism was designed for all, in the fullest sense of the term; that no nation, or class, or sex, or AGE, was excluded.*' Does this harmonize with that assertion of your author, Squire Tanner?"

"I must confess," replied Tanner, "that Mr. Graves has sadly misrepresented Mr. Coleman in this instance, but I presume it was an oversight."

"I fear Brother Graves is very much addicted to such '*oversights,*'" continued Halley, smiling somewhat sarcastically. "But that will be more fully determined hereafter. Here is Neander also: we will call him to the witness-block. This is vol. i. of his CHURCH HISTORY, translated by Prof. Torrey. On page 311, he says: '*Irenæus is the first church teacher in whom we find any allusion to infant baptism.*' Now, Irenæus was born near the close of the *first century*, and was a scholar of Polycarp, who was one of *John the Evangelist*. Does that sound like infant baptism not being introduced till after the *close of the second century*? Neander adds: He (Irenæus) also says, (speaking of Christ), that He came to redeem all by himself; all who, through him, are regenerated to God; *infants, little children, boys, young men, and old*. Hence he passed through every age, and for infants he became an infant, *sanctifying the infants, etc.*'

"From this we discover that be Irenæus whatever he may,

he is not a Baptist, for he does not teach Baptist theology. If you question it, Squire Tanner, just turn to the work you have, page 304, as I have it marked, and you will find there an exposition of what you profess to believe."

Squire Tanner turned slowly to the page indicated, and read: "A mother brings her babe to have it sprinkled. It is a beautiful child, and she verily thinks she is doing God service; and is herself a lovely object as she stands there with the infant in her arms. But now I ask you, is that child regenerated? Is he a branch ingrafted into Christ? Are all his sins forgiven?"

"What do you say to that, Elder Clayton?" interrupted Halley. "How do you answer that question?"

"I should say, *yes*," responded Elder Clayton. "And if that child should die at the moment of consecration, or immediately after—or should it die in infancy without such a consecration—it is certain to enjoy the holiness of heaven: for our Savior expressly declares it. But I would like to know, Squire Tanner, what your author says further—how he answers the question."

"He says, emphatically, *no*," said Tanner; "and I will read a little more: 'You say, *no*; it is absurd to think of such a thing. Then I reply, your baptism *is a falsehood*; for it is designed to signify and seal those things, which in this subject do not and cannot exist.' What say you to that, Mr. Halley?"

"We say they *do* and *can* exist, or the child would be damned should it die in infancy. A man using such language as that you have just read, must, if he be *honest*, believe, in the depths of his soul, that infants are not saved. But Irenæus says that infants are 'born again,'—'reborn' or 'regenerated—unto God.' If he is correct, as we verily believe, then are they not a branch ingrafted into Christ? Is not all their sin—which is but inherited sin—forgiven? Irenæus says, yes; and the term he uses, by those best able to judge—who have studied his style and writings—implies that they have also been baptized.

“Says Dr. Woods, in speaking of this testimony: ‘These allusions, however, are of such a nature, that they cannot well be accounted for without supposing that infant baptism was then the *uniform practice*.’

“Says Lyman Coleman: ‘*Regenerating unto God* is supposed to relate to the act of *baptizing*. Baptism, according to the *usus loquendi* of the age, was regeneration. This, Neander himself admits, in commenting on the above passage from Irenæus, which he receives as valid and incontrovertible proof of the practice of infant baptism at this early age. How else can an unconscious infant be regenerated, save by baptism, according to the views then prevalent respecting this ordinance?’

“We do not believe with Irenæus, that there is any *efficacy* in baptism itself; in the case of infants, it signifies that their inherited sin has been wiped out by the blood of Jesus, and that thereby they are regenerated and constituted members of Christ’s kingdom; and in this argument our only inquiry is, whether it appears from his writings, that infant baptism was the *prevailing practice*. Wall, Schroeck, and other writers of the first ability, with the best of reasons, consider him as referring to baptism—to infant baptism—in the term he uses. We have then already found one prominent teacher born in the *first* century, very soon after the death of the Apostles, and possibly whilst the Apostle John was yet living, *who is not a Baptist*.”

“Is there not some mistake about this?” asked Elder Mason.

“None whatever,” responded Halley. “There can be no mistake about it. The testimony is too abundant to admit of the possibility of an error as to his statements. Here is a little volume by Grey, page 57, where he gives the language of Irenæus in his old age: ‘I can describe the spot on which Polycarp (his instructor and the disciple of John), sat and expounded; his going in and coming out; the manner of his life; the figure of his body; the sermons he preached to the multi-

tudes; how he related to us his conversation with John, and the rest of those who had seen the Lord; how he mentioned their particular expressions, and what things he had heard from them of the Lord, of his miracles and of his doctrines.'

"Coleman gives the same in substance, and remarks on it: 'This proves that Polycarp had diligently inquired from those who could tell him, concerning our Lord and his doctrine. He had made himself master of whatever was to be known. It proves also that such *traditions were repeated by him in his public discourses to the people*; the best of all possible modes of instruction. Moreover, these discourses made the deepest impression on the memory of Irenæus, who expressly mentions "reborn infants"' (see Coleman, page 383).

"There cannot exist a doubt that Irenæus regarded infants as included under the Gospel scheme, and as fit subjects for baptism. But Mr. Graves says that the Gospel has nothing to do with infants, and he is not alone. Dr. Alex. Carson, one of our most learned Baptist divines, openly declares (*Baptism in its Mode and Subjects*, p. 173), that children cannot be saved by the Gospel, nor by faith. 'The Gospel has nothing to do with infants, nor have Gospel ordinances any respect to them. The Gospel has to do with those who hear it. It is good news; but to infants it is no news at all. They know nothing of it. The salvation of the Gospel is as much confined to believers as the baptism of the Gospel is. None can ever be saved by the Gospel who do not believe it. Consequently, by the Gospel, no infant can be saved. Infants who enter heaven must be regenerated, but not by the Gospel. Infants must be sanctified for heaven, but not through the truth as revealed to man. We know nothing of the means by which God receives infants; nor have we any business with it.' Do you endorse this, Elder Mason? Fine consolation, truly, for Christian parents at the grave of their beloved offspring! If 'they are not saved by the Gospel, nor through the truth as revealed to man,' how are

they saved at all? The fundamental principle of the Gospel is, that out of Christ there is no salvation. Christ is the sum and substance of the Gospel scheme, and there is no other name given under heaven and among men whereby we can be saved; and this is the 'truth which is revealed to man.' How then are infants to be saved? Does not Dr. Carson effectually cut off all salvation for them? And this is what your doctrine leads to when carried out. Is Christ willing to save only adults? The exclusion of a part of our race from the blessings of the kingdom of heaven on account of age has not the slightest warrant in the word of God; and our noblest impulses, and our deepest religious feelings rise up and condemn such exclusiveness, and such an unfeeling doctrine.

“‘If temporal estates may be convey'd
By cov'nants, on condition,
To men, and to their heirs; be not afraid,
My soul, to rest upon
The covenant of grace by mercy made.’”

“Justin Martyr was contemporaneous with Irenæus, and born about the same time. He is called the first man of letters who adorned the church after the Apostle Paul. He wrote in Greek. In his apology for Christians, addressed to Antonius Pius, his second apology, he says: ‘There are many persons of both sexes, some sixty, and some seventy years old, who were made disciples to Christ from their infancy, or childhood’ (*ἐκ παιδων, ek pidone*). By this same word the Evangelists used to represent the children Jesus took up in his arms and blessed—and when he said, ‘Suffer little children to come unto me’ (See Matt. xix. 13, 14; Mark x. 13–15, and Luke xviii. 16). Justin Martyr does not use the word baptism here; but how were they made disciples except by baptism? Dr. Dwight justly remarks that ‘there never was any other mode of making disciples from *infancy* except by baptism.’ Dr. Woods says: ‘I think it altogether probable, and beyond any reasonable doubt, that Justin

meant in this place to speak of those who were made disciples, or introduced into the school of Christ by *baptism*, when they were infants. Dr. Pond also says: 'They were doubtless made disciples by baptism, for the same word, "*they were proselyted,*" or "*made disciples*" (ἐμαθητεύθησαν, *emathetuthesan*), is used by Christ in the commission: "Go and disciple, or proselyte (μαθητεύσατε), all nations, baptizing them," etc.' (Matt. xxviii. 19). Justin Martyr then could not have been a Baptist, for he believed in infant discipleship, and therefore necessarily infant baptism. Now Squire Tanner," continued Halley, consulting his little memorandum-book as usual, "turn, if you please, to p. 331 of your book, and you will find it there stated, that 'Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and others, so far from *directly* speaking of infant baptism, *never once utter a syllable* on the subject.' But in the light of what has already been said: Did not Irenæus when he spoke of '*infants regenerated or born again,*' and Justin Martyr, when he spoke of '*infant discipleship,*' mean infant baptism? Is there never a syllable uttered on the subject? Our best authorities say that it is *directly* mentioned. And Prof. M. Stuart, in an article of vast research and learning, found in the BIBLICAL REPOSITORY, vol. iii. p. 355, says: 'Justin Martyr in his dialogue with Trypho, the Jew, compared baptism with circumcision, and speaks of it as an initiatory ceremony.' So Coleman, p. 385, says: 'In his dialogue with Trypho, the Jew, Justin contrasts and compares baptism with circumcision. We draw near to God by him, for we have not received circumcision by the flesh, but that which is spiritual, as Enoch and others observed. This we, though sinners, receive through the compassion of God by baptism, which ALL are permitted to receive.' Justin does not exclude *any* one on account of his age; he says, *all* are permitted to receive baptism. Also he compared and contrasted baptism with circumcision, that is, they were *alike* in their nature and use. Could he talk about circumcision and not talk about infant circum-

cision? Were not the Jews circumcised in their infancy? And believing, as he did, that baptism came in the place of circumcision, could he talk about baptism in this general manner, and not include infant baptism?"

"But you forget," said Elder Mason, "that it is stated by Mr. Graves that they did not *directly* speak of infant baptism!"

"No, Elder Mason, I do not forget. It is stated in that work, that, so far from *directly* speaking of infant baptism, they *never once uttered a syllable on the subject*: not a syllable on the subject? Can that be true, in view of the testimony given? I leave it for you to judge.

"Tertullian comes next in order. He was born about forty-five years after the Apostles, and wrote about one hundred years after the death of John. He and Origen were both young men at the death of Irenæus and Justin Martyr. Tertullian is the first man who speaks against infant baptism; and whilst he recognizes its existence and prevalence, and he himself expressly recommends that infants be baptized *if not likely to survive the period of infancy*; yet, in consequence of his peculiar notions, he advises that baptism in all other cases be *delayed* until a later period of life."

"Do you know his reasons for advising delay in cases of baptism?" asked Anna.

"His *only* reason was, that he believed that sins committed *after* baptism could never be forgiven."

"O yes," said Elder Mason, "he is the man to whom a certain lady, named Quintilla, wrote, asking something about the matter of baptism—and you say he only advised delay?"

"That was all, sir! And that delay had reference not only to children, but to *all unmarried* persons: for he thought it was dangerous on account of their peculiar temptations to sin. But do you wish to know just what Tertullian says about the matter? Here is the passage in the original language—Tertullian's Treatise De Baptismo, chap. xviii.; and here also is a

translation of it from the best authorities, which I have compared with the original and found to be correct. Miss Anna, will you take the book and read the passage?"

Anna took the work and read the passage he had marked. "But they whose duty it is to administer baptism, should know, that it is not to be given rashly. '*Give to every one that asketh thee,*' has its proper subject, and relates to almsgiving. But *that* command is rather to be regarded: '*Give not that which is holy to dogs, neither cast your pearls before swine; and Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins.*' Therefore, according to every person's *condition* and *disposition*, and *age*; also, the delay of baptism is more profitable, *especially as to little children.*"

"Mark there!" interrupted Halley, "he does not talk about prohibition as though they had not a universally conceded right to it, but delay only. Please read on, Anna."

"For," Anna continued, "why is it necessary that the sponsors should incur danger? For they may either fail of their promise by death, or may be disappointed by the child's proving to be of a wicked disposition. Our Lord says indeed, *forbid them not to come to me.* Let them come then, when they are grown up; let them come when they understand; let them come when they are taught whither they are to come; let them become Christians when they are able to know Christ? Why should their innocent age make haste to the forgiveness of sin? Men act more cautiously in temporal concerns. Worldly substance is not committed to those, to whom divine things are entrusted. Let them know how to ask for salvation, that you may seem to give to him that asketh. It is for a reason of *no less importance*, that unmarried persons, both those who were never married, and those who have been deprived of their partners, should, *on account of their exposure to temptation, be kept waiting*, till they are either married, or confirmed in a habit of chaste single life. They who understand the *importance of*

baptism, will be more afraid of hastening to receive it, than of delay."

"Thus testifies Tertullian," said Halley; "and as Dr. Woods' remarks on this passage are so appropriate, I cannot refrain from reading them. He says: 'The strange opinions which he entertained, as a Montanist, have nothing to do with his testimony as to *facts*; especially as to facts, to which he makes no appeal in support of his peculiar opinions; and most of all as to facts, against which he objects, and which he attacks with severity. In regard to such facts, his testimony is entitled to full credit. For what motive could he possibly have to assert things, which stood in the way of his own sectarian views, unless those things actually existed? Would any author, especially one who wished to set himself up as the head of a sect, speak of the existence of a practice which he disapproved, and which was directly opposed to his favorite object, when at the same time he was aware that no such practice existed? Could he have had any motive whatever to treat infant baptism as he did, unless he, and those for whom he wrote, knew that it was a common practice? This has never been shown; and I am greatly mistaken if it ever can be.'"

"It occurs to me," said Anna, "that, if this practice, which he opposes, was an *innovation* since the time of the Apostles—it being only one hundred years from them, and he being a very learned man—certainly he must have known it; and when, and under what circumstances, it was introduced. Here is a passage in one of your books from Mr. Coleman, page 385, which strikes me with force, and I will read it: 'The authorities which have been cited, carry back the ordinance of infant baptism to a period of less than one hundred years from the age of the Apostles. When was it introduced, if not by the Apostles? And by whose *authority*, if not by *theirs*? To these important inquiries all history is silent, assigning no time for its first introduction, nor revealing the least excitement,

controversy, or opposition to an innovation so remarkable as this must have been if it was obtruded upon the churches without the authority of the Apostles. How, especially, could this have been effected in that age which adhered so strictly, even in the smallest things, to ancient usage and authority, and which was so near to the Apostles, that their usages and institutions must have been distinctly known by tradition? Or how could the change have been effected in so short a space of time? Hath a nation changed their gods in a day? Have they in a day changed their cherished institution? Far from it.' This is the same man that is represented, with Kitto and Neander, as saying that infant baptism was not introduced till *after the second century*, — is he not, Mr. Halley?"

"The very same," responded Halley. "And much worse than all that, is he represented as saying. Squire Tanner, will you please turn to your work, page 324, and read what he — your author I mean — says about Mr. Coleman?"

Squire Tanner did as requested, after a moment's hesitation. He read: "Coleman, another of your own writers, and a citizen of our own country, says: 'Though the *necessity* of infant baptism was *asserted* in Africa and Egypt in the beginning of the *third century*, it was even to the end of the *fourth* by no means generally observed, least of all in the Eastern church, and it finally became a general ecclesiastical institution in the age of Augustine,' which you know was at the beginning of the fifth century."

"This passage," said Halley, "I have, as yet, never found in Coleman's writings—it may be in them—but he is not a man who is thus given to contradict directly and expressly his own statements. But you *may* find on pages 382, 383, this passage; which you will perceive does not harmonize very well with Mr. Graves' statement; but it *does harmonize* with what I have read of him elsewhere, and is unquestionably his sincere belief. 'But why did not Tertullian, in his zeal against infant baptism,

employ another and most conclusive argument? Why not say, 'This practice is a dangerous innovation, a fiction of the day. It was unknown fifty years ago; unknown to the apostolic churches, unknown to the Apostles themselves. From the beginning it was not so. Ye know the teaching of the Apostles. Ye know the traditions of the churches; ye know it was not so.' Such an argument against the object of his aversion would have been conclusive, and must have suggested itself to this adroit tactician. Why did he not use it? *Plainly, because he could not.* He could only reason from his own principles, and *pass in silence* the mightier argument of the authority and usage of the apostolic churches, *because this was directly opposed to him.* His condemning the practice, not only proves its *previous existence*; it proves more. It proves that this was no innovation. When a man condemns a practice, he is naturally desirous to support his peculiar views by the strongest arguments. Could Tertullian, therefore, have shown that the practice was of recent origin, that it had been introduced in his own day, or even at any time subsequent to the lives of the Apostles, we have every reason to believe, that he would have availed himself of a ground so obvious, so conclusive. It proves still further, *that the baptism of infants was the GENERAL PRACTICE of the church in Tertullian's time* (in the second century, and not a hundred years after the Apostles). His opinion is his own. It is that of a *dissent from the universal body of professing Christians.* He *never pretends* to say that *any part of the church held or acted upon it.*' This is the language used and adopted by Mr. Coleman; and I would ask, if there is any mistaking its import? The quotation is a libel upon his opinion—if it is a quotation. He states it as his belief that infant baptism was the *general* practice, not only in Tertullian's time, but even back through the history of the church even to the time of the Apostles."

"And is there not great force in these remarks?" asked

Anna. "If it had been an innovation, would not Tertullian have urged it *as such*; and thus put it down at once? This would have been *natural*—this would have been the most powerful argument he could possibly have urged against it. It is absurd to suppose that he could or would have overlooked such an argument, in the zeal and spirit he manifests in opposition to the practice. If he *could* have opposed it by asserting that it was a practice unusual or unknown in the apostolic churches, he certainly would have done so. Would he not?"

"Yes," replied Halley, "it is remarkable that Tertullian does not appeal to any usage of the church at all—nor to any part of the church from the time of our Savior down to his own time, in support of his peculiar belief. If it had been possible, he most certainly would have denounced it as an *innovation* both hurtful and uncalled-for, and thus have put it down effectually."

"What does Brother Graves say of Tertullian, Squire Tanner?" asked Elder Clayton.

"On page 334, he sums up the matter by saying: 'We simply say that it did *not* exist before;—that this is the *first* proposal to introduce it (infant baptism), and that it *was* opposed.'

"Very brief and concise," said Halley. "It did *not* exist before, and it *was* opposed! Will you claim him then for a brother Baptist? He is called an acute reasoner—your own men call him a learned and acute reasoner—and yet it had never occurred to him that this infant baptism was an innovation; that there was an 'unanswerable argument' in the great commission itself to put down effectually all infant baptism tendencies! Nor is he exactly *orthodox* on the great text 'believe and be baptized;' for he seems to think it necessary, as an additional qualification to belief, that they *should be previously married!* I presume he would have amended the commission, and have had it read, 'believe, *get married*, and then

be baptized.' He does not, in some other points, seem fully to be allied in faith to the belief of his brethren in these times; especially as he is so ignorant as to advocate the giving of the ordinance of baptism to infants, if not likely to live to grow up and get married. Probably he would have been much wiser if he had lived in our day, and have been under the tuition of some of our Baptist writers. But as he is the only one we have as yet found, corresponding at all with their creed, and as we are inclined to be generous, we will put him down as a Baptist.

"Dr. Mosheim, in his Church History, says of Tertullian: 'He was endued with great genius, but seemed deficient in point of judgment. His piety was warm and vigorous, but at the same time melancholy and austere. His learning was extensive and profound; and yet his *credulity* and *superstition* were such as might be expected from the darkest ignorance. And with respect to his reasonings, they had more of that subtlety that dazzles the imagination, than of that solidity that brings light and conviction to the mind.'

"Says Dr. Wall, a very candid and reliable writer, who was born in 1645 or '6 and died in 1727 or '8, and spent the most of his life in the study of the Church Fathers and the early writers of the Christian era: 'Tertullian fell into the heresy of the Montanists, who blasphemously held that one Montanus was that Paraclete or Comforter which our Saviour promised to send: and that fuller and better discoveries of God's will were made to him than to the Apostles, who prophesied only in part. * * But that which most deserves the reader's observation is, that the words of Tertullian do not import that the custom of the Christians at that time was to leave infants unbaptized; but, on the contrary, they plainly intimate that there was a custom of baptizing them; only he dislikes that that custom should be generally used' (Vol. i. pp. 87 and 99). So Dr. Wardlaw, of Glasgow, takes the same view of his testimony. 'Tertullian's condemning the practice of baptizing infants, so far from being

in their (the Baptists') favor, militates against them. It not only proves its previous existence, it proves *more*. *It proves that it was no innovation,*' etc.

"Note Mr. Graves' reasons," continued Halley, laying aside the book he had been quoting from, "that because Tertullian recognizes such innovations as the signing the baptized with the sign of the cross, giving them a mixture of milk and honey, and anointing them with holy oil, therefore infant baptism is also an innovation;—that because these notions existed then, and the doctrines of baptismal regeneration and purgatory date back to about this time, therefore infant baptism is to be classed with them as another innovation! Cogent reasoning this, and like that we have found elsewhere! He might in the same manner reason of the Lord's Supper and of the Sabbath, and class them all as innovations! (See THEODOSIA ERNEST, vol. i. p. 335). To say the least, this kind of argument shows a weakness which is calculated to excite commiseration! Could not Tertullian have informed us, if it had been an innovation, as well as Brother Graves? He opposed it, and brought all the argument he could find to bear against it. And in all the argument that a learned and acute reasoner of that age could bring to bear against infant baptism, there is nothing about its not being a *divine institution*—not a text of Scripture that has the least bearing upon the subject—nothing about infants not being equally entitled to it with *believing unmarried adults*, or *married* even; except on the ground of *expediency*. Nothing about its not being taught and practised by the apostles—he must certainly have known whether it was or not—but simply, *he* thought it expedient that it be *delayed* in the case of infants and unmarried adults! And I must add that his reasoning on that subject has about the same force as that of his brethren, who have adopted him, at a much later day!

"Says Dr. Philip Schaff, the renowned and learned pupil of Dr. Neander, in speaking of Tertullian's testimony (History of

the Apostolic Church, pp. 580 and 581): 'The vast difference of Tertullian's position in this whole controversy from that of the Baptists of our days, must be clear to every one who has any historical or critical judgment. And for this reason is it so preposterous for the Baptists, who otherwise concern themselves mighty little about tradition and ecclesiastical antiquity, so zealously (and honestly no doubt) to appeal to the African Church father. But they feel themselves greatly encouraged by the authority of some great German historians, especially Neander, who, although a Pedobaptist himself, was quite too latitudinarian on this, as on some other points, and suffered his latitudinarianism unconsciously to influence his historical representation of the apostolic and post-apostolic practice.'

"The next link in the chain of our historical argument is Origen. He was born about eighty-five years after the apostles, and was descended from Christian parents, and without doubt was baptized in infancy. His father was a martyr for Christ in the persecution under Severus, one hundred and two years after the apostles, when he was seventeen years old. Eusebius assures us, that his ancestors had been Christians for several generations, and that, 'The Christian doctrine was conveyed to him from his forefathers.' His grandfather, or at least his great-grandfather, must have lived in the time of the apostles. And so he had no further than his own family to go for inquiry how it was practised by the Apostles. Besides all this, Origen was a very learned man, and could not be ignorant of the usages of the churches; in most of which he had traveled, for he was born and bred at Alexandria; so it appears out of Eusebius, that he had lived in Greece, and at Rome, and in Cappadocia, and Arabia, and spent the main part of his life in Syria and Palestine. Says Lyman Coleman, p. 379, 'Timothy and Titus must have been living with the Origen family for many years, and possibly other of the *original* twelve besides John. The "faithful men" to whom they committed the ordinances of

religion, that they might be able to teach others, must have been contemporary with this family for near a hundred years. Now, consider the insatiable curiosity of Origen to acquire knowledge, and his facilities — and is it credible, is it possible, that he should have been ignorant of the custom, the teaching, and the tradition of the apostles respecting the subjects of baptism? This was a rite of almost daily occurrence, common to the church in every place. Origen traveled extensively to obtain information; he visited the apostolic churches, and resided among the chief of them. Could then a rite, totally new, unfounded, and contrary to apostolic injunction and example, have been so established, and so long prevail, as to be received as an ordinance of the apostles? Where was John, the apostle, and Timothy, and Titus, and the “faithful men, able to teach others also?” Where were Polycarp and Irenæus, to say nothing of Barnabas and Hermas, that they did not rebuke and expose the delusion of those who would thus forsake the commandment of the Apostles for the ordinances of man?’

“From this you discover,” continued Halley, “what weight to give to his testimony. Recollect that he was born of Christian parents. He saw his father beheaded for professing Christianity, and he himself suffered as a martyr to his faith in subsequent years. When only seventeen, previous to the execution of his father, in order to encourage him, he wrote to him in these words: ‘Beware, sir, that your care for us does not make you change your resolution.’ Bear this in mind, as we examine his testimony. In his Homily 8th on Levit. c. xii., he says: ‘According to the usage of the church, baptism is given even to *infants*; when if there were nothing in infants which needed forgiveness and mercy, the grace of baptism would seem to be superfluous.’ He here was laboring to establish the doctrine of original sin, and adduces the practice of infant baptism as a proof of it.

“In his Homily on Luke xiv., he says: ‘Infants are baptized for the forgiveness of sins. Of what sins? Or when have they sinned? Or can there be any reason for the laver in their case, unless it be according to the sense we have mentioned above, viz., no one is free from pollution, though he has lived but one day upon the earth. And because by baptism native pollution is taken away, therefore *infants* are *baptized*.’”

“But his most important testimony is found in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, book 5, where he says: ‘*For this cause it was that the church RECEIVED AN ORDER FROM THE APOSTLES, TO GIVE BAPTISM EVEN TO INFANTS.*’”

“Is there no mistake about that?” asked Elder Mason, getting uneasy in his chair.

“No mistake about it at all, sir! You can examine these works yourself—they are of unquestioned authority. Here it is in three different works before me, and here are the translations in each work. Look at it, sir! You can read it. ‘For this cause it was that the church received an order from the Apostles, to give baptism even to infants.’ Is that not satisfactory?”

“What does Brother Graves say about this man Origen?” asked Elder Mason, rather nervously, turning to Squire Tanner.

“I do not know,” said Tanner, “but I will look and see.”

“You look in vain!” said Halley. “Your author—Mr. Graves—has an accommodating memory; and the existence of such a man as Origen entirely slipped his mind! And this is rather remarkable too, inasmuch as Origen was one of the most learned and distinguished of the early church fathers; born only eighty-five years after John (A. D. 185), and of noted Christian ancestry; who translated the Scriptures into various languages by the assistance of others, and helped to disseminate them; a man of vast influence in the church; renowned and travelled. I have no doubt that if, on a scrutinizing and most diligent examination of his works, there could

have been found a sentence that possibly might have been *construed against* infant baptism in any way whatever, he would not have been thus overlooked—no, he would not have escaped so easily; for those of far inferior ability, integrity, and reputation, have been called out from their long resting-places, and have been brought forward as witnesses, because, forsooth, a careless sentence or remark could be *tortured* into an apparent support of Baptist faith. It was because his testimony was *incontrovertible*, his reasoning *irrefutable*, his argument *conclusive* and *unanswerable*, and his evidence *unavoidable*; it was on this account that he was passed over in silence, hoping the learned would not notice, and the ignorant would not know.”

“Are you not severe in your charges?” asked Elder Mason. “Do you insinuate that he is in the habit of *construing* things to suit his own purpose? I think you are not justified in making such a charge.”

“We will see,” replied Halley. “I have been looking over the work carefully, and noted some passages; and therefore am prepared to sustain any such charge, and to meet the challenge of nonjustification in the matter. Turn to vol. i., p. 320. It reads: ‘Was Archbishop Cranmer, who suffered martyrdom for his religion, under Mary, Queen of Scots, a good and holy man?’ Now this is the first time I ever saw it intimated that Mary, Queen of Scots, was really Queen of England; or that Cranmer was a Scotchman; or even that he ever heard of such a person as Mary, *Queen of Scots*, for she was in France, and only a young girl at his death. But to the charge: he says, on the same page, ‘Cranmer, before he was burnt, had been very officious and energetic in bringing Baptists to the stake.’ Now unless he can prove that Joan Bocher and George van Paris were Baptists—which I am sure *you* would not like to do, or to have him do, and thereby endorse their ideal monstrosities and heretical notions—this charge is entirely unfounded with regard to Cranmer ‘*before he was burnt;*’ and whether the

charge can be sustained against him *after he was burnt*, I will leave you to judge. I do not attempt to uphold Cranmer where he erred, or to palliate his crimes, if such they are; but to show that this charge is made merely for effect. His voucher for this statement is Neal's History of the Puritans; and I will read you what he says of these two persons, who are the only ones mentioned in whose death Cranmer had any direct agency. And I desire you to observe the charge brought against them. Was it on the ground of baptism? Was it made because they were Baptists, and therefore repudiated infant baptism? Mr. Graves leaves the impression that they were persecuted in view of their *Baptist* faith; if such is the fact, it is a kind of faith I think *few*, in these times, will endorse. See vol. i., p. 35: 'Among others who fled out of Germany into England, from the rustic war, there were some that went by the name of Anabaptists, who, besides the principle of adult baptism, *held several wild notions* about the Trinity, the Virgin Mary, and the person of Christ. Complaint being made of them to the council, a commission was ordered to six of the bishops, and some other divines, to search after all Anabaptists, heretics, or contemners of the common prayer, whom they were to endeavor to reclaim, and after penance to give absolution; but if they continued obstinate, they were to excommunicate, imprison, and to deliver them over to the secular arm. Several tradesmen who were brought before the commissioners abjured; but Joan Bocher, or Joan of Kent, obstinately maintained that Christ was not truly incarnate of the Virgin, etc., and was burnt. About two years after, one Van Paris, a Dutchman, being convicted of saying that God the Father was only God, and that Christ was not very God, and refusing to abjure, was condemned and burnt in Smithfield.'

"Again: he says, 'Luther urged the princes of his country to persecute those who could not conform to his opinions.' No authority is referred to for this, and for the very best of rea-

sons, there is none reliable to be found; and it did not seem proper, *then*, to assert that there was any. But in vol. i. pages 418-19, he says: 'Luther had no great objections to the Baptists in his early efforts. He encouraged the Munzer of notoriety, who *was a Baptist minister*, and so highly esteemed by Luther, as to be named his Absalom. Their united efforts greatly increased persons of the Baptist persuasion. When the news reached Luther of Carlstadt rebaptizing (that is, baptizing those that had only received popish baptism), that Munzer had won the hearts of the people, and that the Reformation was going on in his absence; he, on the 6th of March, 1522, flew like lightning from his confinement, at the hazard of his life, and without the advice of his patron, to put a stop to Carlstadt's proceedings. (He now refers to some authority): see Maclean's Mosheim, vol. iii. page 45. The success and number of the Baptists exasperated him to the last degree.' I will turn to the authority referred to, and read: 'His zeal (speaking of Carlstadt), however, was intemperate, his plans laid with temerity, and executed without moderation. During Luther's absence, he threw down and broke the images of the saints that were placed in the churches; and instead of restraining the vehemence of a fanatical multitude, who had already begun in some places to abuse the precious liberty that was dawning upon them, he encouraged their ill-timed violence, and led them on to *sedition and mutiny*. Luther opposed the *impetuosity* of this *impudent reformer* with the utmost fortitude and dignity; and wisely exhorted him and his adherents, first to eradicate error from the *minds* of the people, before they made war upon its external signs in the churches and public places; since the former being first removed, the latter must follow of course.' Here you see there is not a word about Munzer, nor a single sentence referring to Baptists, nor to the point in question. There is in a foot-note from Dr. Maclean himself, the following passage: 'On the other hand it must be

owned that Carlstadt was rash, violent, and prone to enthusiasm, as appears from the connections he formed AFTERWARD with the FANATICAL *Anabaptists headed by Munzer*.

“There is nothing in Mosheim which indicates that Munzer and Luther were ever friendly or labored together; not a word that he ever encouraged him in his labors; not a syllable that ‘their united efforts greatly increased persons of the Baptist persuasion;’ nothing intimating anything of the kind! In the passage quoted, Munzer is declared, by your author there, a *Baptist minister*. Let us see what kind of a Baptist minister he was. Dr. Mosheim says (Dr. Murdock’s ed., pages 38, and 202, vol. iii.): ‘Respecting religion there was no great dispute. But when the *fanatic*, Thomas Munzer, who had before deceived several by his *fictitious visions and dreams*, and some others of a similar character, had joined this irritated multitude, from being a *civil* commotion, it became, especially in Saxony and Thuringia, a religious or holy war. * * But these forces were routed without much difficulty by the Elector of Saxony and other princes; *Munzer*, the FIREBRAND OF SEDITION, was put to death, and his aiders and abettors were dispersed.’ The Encyclopædia Americana calls him a ‘*German FANATIC*.’ This, then, is your Baptist divine; and through him your lineage is traced — or rather *to* him. And as to Luther’s persecutions of others, there is not the least foundation for any such charge; for it is a well-known historical fact, that he was ever for peace, and for free and open discussion. He used his influence to *restrain* the princes, and others, from violent measures. He opposed the league of Smalcald, for he said, ‘he believed that men should repose themselves wholly on the providence of God, without venturing upon *any* measures suggested by policy’ (see Mosheim, vol. iii. page 56, n. 6). He openly preached against violent measures being taken, even against his bitterest enemies.

“Again on the same page (320), Mr. Graves says: that

‘Calvin procured the condemnation of Servetus.’ The court at Vienne had condemned Servetus, and he had fled to Geneva, and was there concealed four weeks. Calvin saw him whilst there, and informed the government at Geneva. He was apprehended; the governor of Vienne came with the sentence which had been passed, and requested the court at Geneva to give him up; but on the importunate request of Servetus himself, that he should be tried at Geneva, they refused to give him up; he was consequently tried there, and condemned (see Mosheim, Murdock’s ed., vol. iii. pages 225–6): ‘The court of Geneva, now unanimously, condemned *Servetus* to be burned alive the day following. *Calvin*, and the other ministers of Geneva, interceded for a milder death: but the *court would not yield.*’

“Once more: ‘Our Pilgrim Fathers persecuted the Quakers and the Baptists, and condemned them to banishment and death.’ Will he point out instances, or a *single* instance, where they were condemned to death on account of their religion? If they committed murder or treason, or by any other means violated the laws of the land, they were dealt with as criminals and not as Baptists. Even the celebrated Roger Williams, of whom you made so much capital, was no Baptist when he was banished from Salem. The *Maine Evangelist*, near the close of the summer of 1858, says: ‘Roger Williams was a *Congregational minister* whilst in Massachusetts; and he did not become a Baptist till *two years* after he left the State. He was banished, or rather fled, because the magistrates thought him teaching seditious and revolutionary doctrines, and were about to transport him to England for trial. It was two years after he fled to Rhode Island, before he embraced Baptist views and formed a Baptist church; but *remained in it but a year*; withdrawing from all church connection. Whatever may have been the truth or error of his principles which gave offence, they were such as *he held as a Congregational minister.*’ This

is also found *substantially* in the Encyclopædia Americana. Now *all these* assertions, Elder Mason, which we have been considering, are found on ONE page!"

"Probably that page is an exception," said Elder Mason "No doubt he was misinformed on those points."

"An exception!" repeated Halley, sarcastically. "Let us see if it is an exception. Turn to page 220, where you will find Dr. Wall quoted so as to leave the impression with those who read it, that he admits that the Scriptures furnish no warrant for infant baptism. 'Dr. Wall, the most eminent of them all, distinctly declares: Among all persons that are recorded as baptized by the Apostles, there is no express mention of infants.' Mark the expression: '*no express mention*'! No one claims that there is any *express* mention of the baptism of an infant! Probably, Mr. Graves, if he had thought my name could have been *tortured* into his support, would have placed it on the list of those bearing evidence for him; and the next tract published by the General Baptist Tract Society, or the Baptist Publication Society, entitled, '*Scriptural Guide to Baptism*,' would have attached to my name a *garbled quotation*, wholly misrepresenting my views, and endorsed by Pengilly!"

"The quotation is essentially true as far as it goes. Here is the passage more at large: 'The commission given by our Savior to his disciples, in the time of his mortal life, to baptize in the country of Judea, is not at all set down in Scripture; only, it is said, that they baptized a great many; and the enlargement of that commission given them afterwards (Matt. xxviii. 19), to perform the same office among all the heathen nations, is set down in such brief words, that there is no *particular* direction given what they were to do in reference to the children of those that received the faith; and among all the persons that are recorded as baptized by the apostles, there is no *express* mention of any infant; nor is there, on the other side, any account of any *Christian's* child, whose baptism was

put off till he was grown up, or who was baptized at man's age.' But he says, vol. ii. p. 521, speaking of 1 Cor. vii. 14: 'This interpretation, or such as amounts to the like effect, I have shown to be the most current among the *primitive* Christians. And if it be allowed, there needs *no more* evidence for it (infant baptism) from Scripture.' And again, in vol. iv. p. 509, he says, speaking of children being received through baptism and made members of Christ's kingdom: 'And the sanction here given to the command of such a receiving of them is the *highest* that is ever given; even the same that is given to the command of *receiving* the apostles themselves. For as it was said to them, *He that receiveth you receiveth me; and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me*; so the very same is said here of *receiving children in his name*.'

"Again (p. 220): 'Bishop Burnet says, There is no express precept or rule given in the New Testament for the baptism of infants.' *Express* precept again! *Express* mention, *express* precept, *express* rule, is thrust into your eyes from nearly every page! We claim, and so did Bishop Burnet, that an *express precept* is not *necessary*, for we can be taught truths and doctrines *without express precepts or commands*!

"Next comes Richard Baxter; he is dragged out by Pengilly, and then again by Mr. Graves, and made *apparently* to bear evidence *for* them (p. 220): 'Richard Baxter says, I conclude that all the examples of baptism in the Scriptures do mention only the the administration of it to the professors of saving faith; and the precepts give no other direction.' Let us examine this evidence a little; the quotation is taken from a work where he was reasoning on an *entirely different subject*, and it is only used in the sense of an illustration whereby to throw his opponent in a quandary, and is *NOT his opinion at all*; nor was it put forth as such; and Pengilly and Graves were aware of this when they quoted it! Thus they dragged him in, as they have many others, to bear witness against himself—

and against infant baptism! Is this dealing fairly with the dead? Is it dealing righteously with the truth? Richard Baxter, your name is spread abroad in tracts and books which are scattered broadcast over the world—carried, as by the winds, into every nook and corner of the earth—as though you had borne testimony against that ordinance you so dearly prized, and would have given up no sooner than you would your life! Is this a true representation of you? Did you believe one thing, and advocate and practise another? What have you to say of infants and of their privileges, Richard Baxter? I wonder that such slanders do not call the departed witnesses for Christ from their long resting-places! But, as it happens, Baxter left abundant testimony which, in his own burning words, speaks for him trumpet-tongued! He says: '*God had never a church on earth of which infants were not infant members since there were infants in the world*' (See Commentary on Matt. xxviii. 19). And more, he held public discussions with Baptists on the subject, and published two works on the *Scripture* proof of infant baptism! And yet, notwithstanding all this, these men can quote a passage from another work, treating upon another subject, and which, disconnected from the context, *appears* to witness against the faith in which he lived, and labored, and died, and palm it off upon the people as his belief and teachings! Is this honorable? Is it the index of a true Christian character and spirit? Still these men have set forth equal misrepresentations upon almost every page of their entire works on this subject! I know a young man, now a Pedobaptist clergyman, who was once a Baptist, and was led to see his error just by the garbled quotations found in the '*Scripture Guide to Baptism*,' by Pengilly. He was one of those very few readers who desire to look up the quotations, and to decide for themselves; or who are so situated as to be able to do so. In comparing the representations of Pengilly with the true views of the authors, he was so disgusted that he went into a

thorough and candid investigation of the whole ground; which led him—as I verily believe it will every one, where the investigation is both *thorough and candid, without prejudice*—to see that this peculiar faith of the Baptist denomination is not only *unfeeling and unnatural*, but also *unscriptural and unchristlike*.

“Look now on the next page (221). He says: ‘Even your Presbyterian Doctor Miller, of Princeton Theological Seminary, says: “The fact is, that during the whole threescore years after the ascension of Christ, which is embraced in the New Testament history, we have *no hint of the baptism of infants born of CHRISTIAN PARENTS.*”’

“This is just what *we* have stated here. Mark the expression, ‘infants born of *Christian parents!*’ That is not saying, nor did he believe, there was no hint of the baptism of infants born of *Gentile and Jewish* parents, who were converted to the Christian faith. He (Graves) well knew that probably not one in a hundred of the readers of that work would notice the difference; and yet it makes all the difference in the world. Mr. Graves did not expect his readers to have discernment enough to notice that that quotation was one which tended to overthrow the very point he was trying to establish; but only, that he had the *name* of such a renowned man as Dr. Miller on *his side*, helping him to overthrow the whole structure of pedobaptism! What a mistake! I repeat the words of Dr. Miller: ‘that in the New Testament history we have no hint of the baptism of infants born of *Christian parents*—nor of such infants when they were *grown up to be adults*, and who *believed* and were reckoned among Christ’s followers! How is this? Can Mr. Graves explain it? Will you tell me the reason. We have numerous accounts of *Gentile and Jewish* converts, who, when they believed, were baptized and *their families*; but never a lisp of a *believer’s child* being baptized, which, when arriving at an age of understanding, *believed also*. Not one. Yet there must have been many thousands of them, for the time embraced

in the New Testament history comprises several generations of children. Read Dr. Miller's argument, and you will find that he has not left us in doubt with regard to his belief: I would recommend it to your perusal. I will quote but two short passages from it. 'Although the New Testament does not contain any specific texts which, in so many words, declare that the infant seed of believers are members of the church in virtue of their birth; yet it abounds in passages which cannot be reasonably explained but in harmony with this doctrine. Instead of our Baptist brethren having a right to call upon us to find a *direct* warrant in the New Testament in favor of infant membership, we have a right to call upon them to produce a direct warrant for the great and sudden change which they allege took place. If it be as they say, that the New Testament is silent on the subject, *this very silence is quite sufficient to destroy their cause and to establish ours.*' Is this not sufficiently distinct?

"Again, your author remarks (p. 220): 'Martin Luther, the great reformer, says: 'It cannot be proved that infant baptism was instituted by Christ, or by the first Christians after the Apostles.' When or where Luther said this, he does not think proper to inform us. But if he ever did say it, he has also said that which is exactly the reverse of it, as I can point you here to the very pages (See *Singularia Lutheri*, Jena ed., 1564, Art. Baptism, p. 657). He is proving that baptism is not a saving ordinance, and says: 'That the dipping of a child in water, or the sprinkling it with water according to the command of Christ, should cleanse it from sin and transfer it from the kingdom of Satan to the kingdom of God, is reviled by reason.' Again, in the same article, p. 602: 'I consider that by far the safest baptism, is the baptism of children.' Once more, p. 663: 'We conclude that children believe at baptism, and have a faith of their own: that God produces it in them in answer to the faithful prayers and obedience of the sponsors.'

"A vast deal more might be adduced, but this is abundantly

sufficient to prove that Luther's belief and practice was altogether on the other side of the question. Not long since I took up a Baptist publication in which was an article headed '*Martin Luther almost a Baptist,*' and again the old story was told over about Luther's translation of the Bible, in which he renders baptize, *Taufen*, which signifies immerse, etc. I laid the publication down with a feeling akin to disgust. Is it possible, thought I, that they will persist in repeating that same old story, although so often corrected, right in the face of facts, and that too, when every German who can read his Bible will tell them it is false! For a moment let us look at the reason of the thing. When Martin Luther took water in his hand and sprinkled it upon the head of a child, saying, '*Ich taufe dich,*' etc., did he mean, I immerse you? Would the people so understand him? Is it possible?"

"There may be some such thing afloat in newspaper literature," said Elder Mason; "but I do'n't think it ever came from a source authorized by the church. It does not look reasonable."

"It comes, sir, from the very highest authority in your church," replied Halley. "And as it happens, I have that authority at hand. It is in the Report of the Baptist Bible Society for 1840, and on p. 89 it reads: 'Other translators may do as they please; baptize may be twisted into all sorts of meanings *except* immersion—unless, indeed, in the case of old versions. Luther may say that it means to immerse, and his version shall continue to be circulated; but woe be to the Baptists if they say so, and what is the reason?' Mr. Woolsey says also, p. 74, 'That Luther rendered baptize into a word signifying to immerse.'"

"I think they would not say so, if it were not true," said Elder Mason.

"You could sooner believe that Martin Luther would sprinkle a little water on the head of a child before a congregation,

and say, '*I immerse you,*' I suppose! But here is authority at hand. Here is a German Bible, and here are German Lexicons; and let the Germans themselves determine the meaning of words in their own language.

"Weber's German and English Lexicon is of unquestioned authority, and gives the following definitions, which are fully corroborated by Adler's:

"*Taufe*, baptism, christening; *taufen*, to baptize, to christen.

"And here are the German words given for *immerge*, *immerse*, and *immersion*:

"*Immerge*, eintauchen, untertauchen, versenken.

"*Immerse*, eintauchen, untertauchen, versenken.

"*Immersion*, die Eintauchung, das Untertauchen.

"Buckhardt and Adler, in their Lexicons, give the same definitions. The word *taufe* never conveys the idea of immersion to a German mind. This is enough to vindicate Martin Luther, and his version of the Bible.

"On p. 323 he states again: 'John Calvin, the founder of your Presbyterian church, says, It is nowhere expressed by the Evangelists that any one infant was baptized.' He also brings up the name of Dr. Dwight; but what do these men say? Calvin, in his Com. on Harmony of the Evangelists, vol. ii. p. 390, says: 'We, on the other hand, maintain that since baptism is the pledge and figure of the forgiveness of sins, and likewise of adoption by God, it ought not to be denied to *infants*, whom God adopts and washes with the blood of his Son. Certainly *the laying on of hands* was not a trifling or empty sign, and the prayers of Christ were not idly wasted in air. But he could not present the infants solemnly to God, without giving them purity. And for what did he pray for them, but that they might be received into the number of the children of God? Hence it follows, that they were renewed by the Spirit to the hope of salvation. In short, by embracing them, he testified that they were reckoned by Christ among his flock.

And if they were partakers of the spiritual gifts, which are represented by baptism, it is unreasonable that they should be deprived of the outward sign.' And thus speaks Dr. Dwight, vol. iv. p. 340, Sermon 159: 'Such children, then, among Gentiles, as are born of those who profess the religion of the Scriptures, *are included in the covenant, and are to be baptized.*' Mr. Graves refers also to Dr. Taylor, of the Church of England. Dr. Wall says of him, vol. ii. p. 22: 'There were no need of mentioning Bishop Taylor, were it not for some *importunate* anti-pedobaptists, who cite him in this controversy *against his will.* He, in the times of the rebellion in England, wrote a treatise called *The Liberty of Prophesying*, in which he undertook to show how much might be said for two sorts of dissenters, the anti-pedobaptists and the papists; saying thus: "These two are the *most troublesome, and most disliked*; and by an account made of these, we may make judgment what may be done towards others, whose errors are not apprehended of so great malignity." In this he declares himself well satisfied with the principles of pedobaptism, of which he gives a summary account, and says that he "*takes the other opinion to be an error,*" yet under pretence of reciting what may be said for that error, he draws up so elaborate a system of arguments against infant baptism, and sets them forth to the utmost, by such advantage of style, that he is judged to have said more for the anti-pedobaptists *than they were ever before able to say for themselves.*' It is, I presume, like Bishop Whately's argument showing that there never has been such a man as Napoleon Bonaparte. Dr. Whately *believes* that there has lived such a man, yet he made it appear *very probable*, logically, that there never was such a man; yet who would be so silly as to quote passages from this argument, and thereby maintain that Bishop Whately candidly and believingly denied the existence of Napoleon? But this is just what Graves and Pengilly have done in reference to Bishop Taylor!

“And moreover, we notice that on the page already cited, Mr. Graves makes even Prof. Moses Stuart, Dr. Leonard Woods, Dr. Knapp, and Matthew Henry, repeat that there are no ‘*express commands*’ for infant baptism in the New Testament, and thereby endeavors to throw the influence of their names against what they loved, believed, and practised. There are clouds of other quotations that we cannot notice singly; so quoted, and in such connections, and for such purposes, as to come heaven-wide of the faith in which these men lived and died. These men went to the word of God for their doctrine. Whatever would not stand the test of the Holy Scriptures, they rejected. They taught and practised sprinkling as the *proper mode* of baptism; they practised infant baptism, and taught that it was a *Divine institution*, founded and approved by God himself. For the warrant of both these they went, as we now do, to the Bible. And yet these, and other Baptist writers, attempt to lay the influence of their names, and the weight of their piety, into the scale against the doctrines which they believed, practised, and inculcated! These names are brought up in a long category, and arrayed against their brethren by making quotations in such a manner as to create an *unfair and untrue* impression of their views and principles! Take these *names* from their books, and also the quotations annexed to them, and there is nothing left but a lifeless carcass — a skeleton! And one, too, of such a nature and character, that its ‘dry bones’ can never be clothed by the Spirit and word of God! Could Baxter, Calvin, Luther, Wall, Stuart, Chalmers, McKnight, Miller, Burnet, Taylor, Wesley, Whitfield, Doddridge, Henry, Knapp, Dwight, and others, appear here in our midst to-day, they would lift up their voices in withering, burning words, for the ordinances which now their *names* are made to impugn. If I have been severe in these remarks, it is but the severity of truth. Have I been *too* severe in setting forth these misrepresentations?”

“No,” said Elder Clayton. “To be thus dishonest through sectarian zeal in the cause of our Master, can scarcely be denounced with too much severity.”

“Let us resume, then, our chain of evidences for Infant Baptism, drawn from the church fathers. Next after Origen, in the order of time, comes Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, who was born about one hundred years after the Apostles. In the year A. D. 253 — about one hundred and fifty years *only* after the Apostles — sixty-six bishops met in council at Carthage. Fidus, a country bishop, had sent a letter with two cases, on which he desired their opinion. The one which relates to our present subject was, whether an infant might be baptized *before* it was eight days old. In their reply there were the following passages: ‘Cyprian and the rest of the bishops who were present in the council, sixty-six in number, to Fidus our Brother, Greeting.—As to the case of Infants;—*whereas you judge that they must not be baptized within two or three days after they are born, and that the rule of circumcision is to be observed, that no one should be baptized and sanctified before the eighth day after he is born; We were all in the council of a very different opinion. As for what you thought proper to be done, not one was of your mind; but we all rather judged that the mercy and grace of God is to be denied to no human being that is born.—This therefore, dear brother, was our opinion in the council; that we ought not to hinder any person from baptism and the grace of God, who is merciful and kind to all. And this rule, as it holds for all, is, we think, more especially to be observed in reference to infants, even to those newly born.*’ (See Wall’s Hist. In. Bap., vol. i. chap. 6, p. 129 ss.)

“Now, Squire Tanner, turn, if you please, to your text-books, vol. i. p. 221, and vol. ii. p. 226, and you will see it there stated: ‘The necessity of infant baptism was never asserted by any council before that of Carthage, held A. D. 418.’ This is as near the truth as he usually gets. The council was held A. D.

253 (see Mosheim, vol. iii. p. 172; Dr. Hase's Ch. Hist., p. 90; and Schaff's Ap. Ch., p. 581: Dr. Schaff makes it a little *earlier*, A. D. 246), one hundred and sixty-five (or according to Dr. Schaff, 172) years earlier than Brother Graves has it. Now Cyprian, the head of this council, was the successor of Tertullian, a presbyter in Carthage, and was converted in A. D. 246, and received the crown of martyrdom A. D. 259. And in view of this testimony, is it possible to suppose that sixty-six bishops, gathered from all parts of the land, only 150 years after the Apostles, and headed by the most distinguished man in the whole Christian church at that time, should not have doubted—no, not a single one of them—as to the propriety of applying the ordinance of baptism to infants—even 'under eight days old'—if, indeed, it had not been the *universal* practice of the *entire* church of Christ to baptize infants? And this is the more remarkable from the fact that it is the identical spot where Tertullian had labored but a few years before so strenuously to have baptism *delayed* in the case of infants and unmarried persons. But, it seems, Tertullian was not very successful, as in this council, a few years after, there *was not one* of his opinion—*not one* to advocate delay."

"And this," said Anna, "I understand to have been a synod of divines—a council of all the most learned men in the Christian church at that time. With me it has far more weight, that the decision was given in a *public assemblage*, than if it were only the private opinion of the same men. And then it was so near the time of the Apostles; and the *unanimous* opinion of sixty-six divines also: all this shows most conclusively to my mind that infant baptism was not only the opinion and usage of the *whole Christian church*, but had ever been from the time of the Apostles."

"Optatus, Bishop of Milevi," continued Halley, "who was born about two hundred years after the Apostles, is the next witness we will examine. He wrote about two hundred and

sixty years after John the Evangelist, and had been comparing a Christian's putting on Christ in baptism, to putting on a garment. He then says: 'But lest any one say, I speak irreverently in calling Christ a garment, let him read what the Apostle says, *as many of you as have been baptized in the name of Christ, have put on Christ*. Oh! what a garment is this, which is always one, and which fits all ages and all shapes. It is neither too large for INFANTS, nor too small for young men, nor does it need any alteration for women.'

"Here too is the *Oration 20* of Gregory Nazianzen, who was contemporary with Optatus—about two hundred and sixty years after the Apostles. He compares Basil, one of the church fathers, to Samuel, as follows: 'Samuel, among them which call upon his name, was given before he was born, and immediately after his birth was consecrated, and he became an anointer of kings and of priests out of a horn. And was not this man (Basil) consecrated to God in his infancy, and carried to the steps in a coat?' He probably means the steps of the baptismal font.

"Dr. Wall gives an abstract of Gregory's oration on the ordinance of baptism: 'He first gives his opinion in favor of delaying the baptism of children till they are three years old. And still he so expresses himself as to leave no doubt that the usual practice was against him. But on reconsidering the danger to which infants are exposed, and all the circumstances of the case, he *advises* that infants (of a few days old) should be baptized.'

"Thus he and Tertullian are the only men in the early churches who speak of delaying baptism at all; and the reconsideration of the matter led Gregory to recall what he had said on delay, and to give it as his opinion that they should be early in life baptized according to the prevailing custom of the church."

"We cannot call him a Baptist," said Anna, "for an infant

three days old is just as capable of exercising faith as one of three years. And it seems that Gregory repudiated his own advice to *delay* baptism in a fuller consideration of the matter. Therefore Tertullian is the only one yet found who really advocated delay of baptism in the case of infants; and yet he was no Baptist, for he equally advocated a delay of baptism to unmarried persons, even if adults, and capable of exercising faith. There, in reality, has been no Baptist found yet, and we have canvassed nearly *three centuries* from the Apostles."

"And it is also worthy of note," said Halley, "that during this whole period, with scarce an interval, the Christian church had constantly endured civil persecutions of the most direful and bloody character; and that in her progress she had passed through blood and fires, storms and disasters. The professor of the Christian religion was constantly exposed to the dungeon, the rack, and the faggot; and nearly all, or quite, of those church fathers we have referred to, suffered martyrdom for their faith. But we have the testimony of a few more to add to that which has already been adduced. Ambrose, who wrote about two hundred and seventy-four years after the Apostles, in commenting on the first chapter of Luke, and speaking of John, and Elias, and of his parting the waters of the river Jordan, says: 'But perhaps this may seem to be fulfilled *in our time, and in the Apostles' time*. For that return of waters backward toward the head of the river, which was caused by Elias when the river was divided, signified the mystery of the laver of salvation, which afterwards was to be instituted, by which those who are *baptized in infancy* are reformed from a wicked state to the primitive state of their nature.' Here Ambrose testifies that infants were not only baptized *then*, but also '*in the Apostles' time*;' as he says, it was fulfilled *then as now*. And we think, from the proximity of his age to that of the Apostles, and the other advantages he possessed of knowing how long it had been practised, that his testimony is as reliable as that,

at least, of those removed more than fourteen hundred years from him, and whose proofs are, if proofs at all, traced through him and his contemporaries.

“John Chrysostom, who dates within the third century after the Apostles, and who was one of the most able and eloquent preachers that had as yet adorned the primitive church; born at Antioch, bishop of Constantinople, twice banished on account of his zeal in reforming and keeping pure the Christian church, and at length brought, by his sufferings in the bitter persecutions he encountered, to the grave—thus speaks, in his writings which I have here. Homily 40, on Genesis, speaking of circumcision and then of baptism, which God has appointed in the place of the former, ‘But *our* circumcision, that is, *the* grace of baptism, gives cure without pain. And it has no determinate time, as circumcision had; but it is proper that this circumcision without hands should be received by one *in the beginning of life*, or in the middle of it, or in old age. Again, he says: ‘Some think that the heavenly grace (of baptism) consists only in forgiveness of sins; but I have reckoned up ten advantages of it. For this cause *we baptize infants also, though they are not defiled by sin*’—meaning, doubtless, actual sin.

“There are other passages in the works of John Chrysostom, bearing on this subject, but we will pass them, and proceed to call a still more noted church father named Augustine; who was born 254 years after the Apostles, and one of the most pious, learned, devoted, and remarkable of all the church fathers. His father was a pagan till near the close of his life; his mother (Monia), was eminently pious. He was converted at the age of thirty-three (A. D. 387); was bishop of Hippo thirty-five years (395–430); and during this time was indefatigable in preaching, writing, combating error and vice, and infusing life and spirituality into the churches and clergy far and near (see Mosheim, vol. i. page 253, n. 35). ‘He was,’ says history, ‘one of the most sincere and ardent Christians of his

time.' Dr. Wall says (vol. i. page 241): 'St. Augustine was a man of note in the church, and continued writing books for forty years and more. There never was any one man whose pains were so successful in healing the wounds of the church caused by schisms and heresies. His moderate and popular way of arguing had a great effect.' Again (page 259): 'St. Augustine speaks here of infant baptism, and we see a full evidence that it was then universally practised, and had been so beyond the memory of any man or of any record: that they took it to be a thing that had not been "enacted by any council," but had "ever been in use" from the beginning of Christianity. And they had then but 300 years to look back to the times of the Apostles, whereas we now (about 1725), have 1600. *And the writings and records which are now lost, were then extant, and easily known.*'

"In view of all this, we shall see that his testimony in relation to the history of the ordinance of infant baptism, taken in connection with that of his renowned contemporary, Pelagius, 'the learned heretic,' is strong and explicit; not only that infants were then baptized, but that this usage was universally, in the Christian church, practised and understood; and also acknowledged to have been handed down from the very times of the Apostles."

"Was not there a controversy between these two men?" asked Elder Mason. "What was the ground of their controversy?"

"Pelagius," replied Halley, "denied the depravity of the human heart, and the necessity of divine grace, and the influence of the Spirit in man's regeneration. He also maintained that the human will is as much inclined to good as to evil, and that good works constitute the meritorious cause of salvation. History records (see Mosheim, vol. i. page 370), that Pelagius, and his colleague and companion, Celestius, were in high reputation for their virtues and piety; and that the success of Pela-

gius was great, but that he found a powerful opponent in the person of the famous Augustine, bishop of Hippo, who exposed the unscriptural character of the system, and its direct tendency to subvert the grand doctrine of the gospel, and to render the cross of Christ of none effect. In one of his arguments against Pelagius, and in proving the doctrine of original sin, he asks: 'Why are infants baptized for the remission of sins if they have no sin?' Intimating thereby to Pelagius, that the denial of original sin must draw after it the denial of infant baptism. Now mark the reply of Pelagius, which, under the circumstances, was striking and unequivocal. Says Pelagius: '*Baptism ought to be administered to infants, with the same sacramental words which are used in the case of adult persons. Men slander me, as if I denied the sacrament of baptism to infants. I NEVER HEARD OF ANY, not even the most impious heretic, who denied baptism to infants.*' Again, Augustine remarks in reference to the Pelagians: 'Since they grant that infants must be baptized, *as not being able to resist the authority of THE WHOLE CHURCH, WHICH WAS DOUBTLESS DELIVERED BY OUR LORD AND HIS APOSTLES*, they must consequently grant that they stand in need of the benefit of the Mediator.'

"With this argument, the Pelagians were much pressed. It would have been very much to their purpose, if it had been in their power, to assert that Augustine was wrong in his position and statement; and that the baptism of infants was not enjoined by Christ and his Apostles. Or if they had known of any sect or society of Christians existing in their day, or before their time since the Apostles, who disowned infant baptism, or had raised objections to it, their own interests would have led them to plead such an example in behalf of their position and their argument. But they were so far from being able to do this, that they were obliged to concede that they *never saw nor heard* of any one, either Christian or heretic—no, nor any writer who pretended to believe in the Scriptures, who denied

baptism to infants. Celestius, who assisted Pelagius in the propagation of his peculiar doctrines, said: 'Infants are to be baptized according to the rule of the UNIVERSAL CHURCH.'

"Could there have been any sect denying infant baptism," asked Anna, "and they not have known of its existence?"

"Pelagius was born in Britain (probably a Welshman), and Celestius in Ireland," replied Halley. "They both lived a long time in Rome, to which all the people of the then known world had resort. They were both some time in Sicily; and then in Carthage a considerable period. Then Pelagius traveled through Egypt, and settled in Jerusalem for many years. Celestius went from Carthage to Ephesus and Constantinople, and in fact visited all the noted churches in both Europe and Asia. In view of this, we should consider it impossible that there should have been a sect, or even a church, that denied the practice of infant baptism in *all Christendom*, and they not have heard of it. The conclusion is irresistible, that there was not at that time, nor within the memory of the men of that time, any Christian society which denied baptism to infants."

"What! not one Baptist church in all Europe, Asia, and Africa?" exclaimed Elder Clayton. "And this was only three hundred years after the Apostles! If there ever had been any, what had become of them?"

"That is a question," replied Halley, "that I have never heard answered—or even attempted to be answered. Here in all the known countries where Christianity had penetrated, there was not a church where infant baptism was not practised at that time, or where it had not been practised within the recollection of the oldest men then living, or where they had ever heard of its being rejected! And the most talented and learned men of those times declare it to have been an apostolic institution—'delivered by our Lord,'—and that it had ever been practised. And those whose interest it was to make contrary statements, if possible, assure us that they never heard of any one,

even the most impious heretic, who denied baptism to infants. This, then, is conclusive testimony; and he, who demands more than this, is not reasonable.

“But turn, if you please, Squire Tanner, to your text-book, vol. ii. p. 467, and you will find it there stated: ‘If we now go back to the year 300, we will find *all* the churches to be Baptist churches in regard to *baptism*, except a few in Africa.’ Is this possible, and yet not a trace of any such existence to have been found, or even known, a few years later? How did Brother Graves know that they were *all* Baptist churches? Has he intuitions on the subject? If they were all Baptist churches, in spite of all history and every assurance to the contrary, we have only to say that they were *very unlike* their brethren of a later day! And with such Baptists we have very little difference of opinion, and none whatever in the practice of infant baptism!

“But let us quote a very little more from Augustine. In remarking on the passage, 1 Cor. vii. 14, he says: ‘There were *Christian infants* who were sanctified (that is, baptized) by the authority of one or both of their parents.’ Again, in speaking of the good which Christian baptism does to infants, he remarks: ‘That the faith of those by whom the child is brought to be consecrated, is profitable to the child.’ This sounds very much like the Pedobaptist doctrine of the present day. If you should desire to see more evidence on this subject from Augustine and the other church fathers, as I have not time to bring it up here, I would refer you to these works, which I have been quoting from: Dr. Wall’s *Hist. of Infant Baptism*, vols. i. and ii.; Dr. Woods on *Infant Baptism*; Dr. Kurtz’s *Infant Baptism*; Dr. Alexander’s *Life*, chap. ix. etc. etc. There are other works here in Latin, and some in Greek; but those I have mentioned contain translations from these authors, and the translations are sufficiently numerous and forcible to satisfy every rational and candid mind that infant baptism was gene-

rally practised from the apostolic age down to the fall of the Western Empire. And at that time it is acknowledged by all to have been in general use. Yes, there is one unbroken chain of evidence — Augustine, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Optatus, Cyprian and his sixty-six bishops, Origen (Tertullian, in our generosity, though no Baptist, we will *donate* to them, as a kind of peace-offering), Justin Martyr, and Irenæus, who was born in the first century whilst the Evangelist John was living, and therefore knew and handed down apostolic customs and usages. According to the united testimony of these men — for it all harmonizes, even Tertullian's is as strong as any in bearing evidence to the fact of the general prevalence of infant baptism — the universal Christian church, all along during the lives of these fathers of the church, down through three centuries, till we have *abundant* and *unquestioned* testimony, practised infant baptism; and these evidences, further, assure us that at the close of the third century after the Apostles, there was not a *single* Baptist church in the whole Christian world — not *one*, having or professing the faith peculiar to our Baptist brethren, then existing in all Christendom; nor was it known that there ever had been!

“Says Dr. Woods: ‘We have evidence as abundant, and specific, and certain as history affords of almost any other fact; that *infant baptism universally prevailed from the days of the Apostles through four centuries.*’ Says Dr. Schaff: ‘Origen of Alexandria, the most learned representative of the Greek church, who was himself baptized soon after his birth (85 years after John, A. D. 185), and was at the death of Tertullian (about A. D. 220) some thirty-five years of age, speaks in the most unequivocal terms of *infant baptism as an apostolic tradition, and the universal practice of the church.* And those who interpret the silence of ecclesiastical writers before Tertullian respecting infant baptism unfavorably to it, *do not consider*, in the first place, that we have very few written memo-

rials of any kind from this age, and are left wholly in the dark on many other points; and in the second place, that at that time the great missionary zeal, and the rapid spread of the church, made the baptism of proselytes still more frequent, and, in the nature of the case, most thought of. Finally, even in Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, and Justin Martyr, *there is no lack of hints* which indicate, with more or less certainty, the existence of infant baptism.'

"Says Dr. Wall (vol. i. chap. 21): 'Irenæus (born in the time of the Apostles), Epiphanius, Philostrus, Augustine, and Theodoret, who wrote catalogues of all the sects and sorts of Christians that they knew, or had ever heard of, make no mention of any who denied *infant* baptism, except those who denied *all* baptism. Each of them mentions some sects that used no baptism at all; and these sects Augustine represents as disowning the Scripture, or a great part of it. *But of all sects that acknowledged water baptism in any case, NO ONE is mentioned that DENIED IT TO INFANTS.*' Dr. Wall further says: 'That the first body of men we read of, that denied baptism to infants, were the Petrobrusians, A. D. 1150.'

"Now turn to THEODOSIA ERNEST, (vol. i. pp. 161 and 163), and you will find it there stated: 'That Presbyterian ministers have been trained and educated in error. They have trusted to the assertions of others, who had an interest in deceiving them.—They do not examine the historical records for themselves.—From the *very earliest ages* of Christianity, up to the present time, there has been a body of professing Christians who have always held, as we do now, that baptism is not valid unless it be preceded by instruction and faith in Christ; and, consequently, that the baptism of infants is no baptism at all.' And here," continued Halley, drawing a small pamphlet from his pocket, "is a tract published by the General Baptist Tract Society, and signed Pengilly—who, as I have before remarked, or at least intimated, is a very near relative. *logically,*

of Mr. Graves. This tract says: 'Our principles are as old as Christianity. Persons holding our distinctive principles; that is, the baptism of believers only, have appeared in all ages of the Christian era. From Christ to nearly the end of the second century, *there were no others*; at least if there were, their history is a blank. After Christianity was introduced, many opposed it,' etc.

"Now what authority is given for this sweeping assertion? Not a scrap of evidence, either sacred or profane; and for the best of all reasons—there is no such evidence in the world. Most earnestly has it been sought for; and such has been the zeal, that quotations have been made from *spurious* works; others *altered* by those who cited them; some *tortured* so as to convey a very different meaning from that of the authors; and others even *forged* expressly for the occasion. (See Dr. Wall, vol. ii. chap. i.) But all these, Argus-eyed Christianity has exposed; and everything not bearing the test and stamp of genuineness, has been rejected by every candid writer, whose sectarian zeal did not run away with his honesty—who was not more anxious to advance the cause of his party than the cause of his Master.

"Brothers Graves and Pengilly are too much influenced by sectarian zeal in this respect. We have already noticed their misrepresentations; and I will only give two examples here of their citing *unreliable* authorities. See THEODOSIA, vol. i. pp. 323 and 325 (see also 'Scripture Guide to Baptism'): 'Ludovicus Vives, a name of high historical authority, says, None of old was wont to be baptized but in grown age, and who desired it, and understood what it was.'—'The learned Curcelleus is one of them, and he says: Infant baptism was not known in the world the first two centuries after Christ.'

"Dr. Wall, who wrote about 1600, and whose statements are considered perfectly reliable, *even by Mr. Graves* (see THEODOSIA, vol. i. p. 176), says of these men (vol. ii. p. 16): 'Since

this Vives lived so little while ago (1492–1541, a Spaniard), and *produces no proof* out of any author to confirm his opinion, his affirming anything concerning any old customs is of no more authority than if any one now living should say the same, without producing his proof. Especially since he was but a young man when he wrote these commentaries, and, though learned in philosophy and *secular* history, yet confesses himself in his preface to them, *that as for divinity, which was none of his profession, he minded it only so far as his other studies would give him leave.* Curcelleus says the same thing as Vives does. And there is to be said of him not only what was said of Vives, that affirming a thing of antiquity, he produces no quotation for proof, but also that *he brings it in to maintain another tenet as paradoxical as this (the denial of infant baptism in the early Christian church) itself is.* Like Pelagius, he denied original sin; but not like Pelagius he makes this statement as an argument in its favor. Pelagius would have done it if he could consistently with truth; but he did not affirm it, from the fact that he knew it to be false, and that the Christian world would have, at the time, denounced it as such.

“But to return: among all the investigations, thorough and critical, of the ancient records and of the writings of the early church fathers, piles of proof on proof have been found in support of infant baptism, and for its divine authority and existence through the first four centuries of the Christian era; but *not a lisp* has been, or can be, found militating against its existence, general practice, and divine authority. Baptists persist in asserting that it was not introduced till after the second century; but they do not pretend, nor have they attempted, to tell us *how* it was *then* introduced. They say that when it was introduced it was opposed. Who opposed it? What church—what council of divines? Who, among all the early Christians, declares it to have been *not* of divine authority, and *not* in general use? The fathers tell us that they *never*

heard of such a man, but, on the contrary, assure us that it *was* of divine authority, and that it was a custom and ordinance of the *universal church*. All history is *silent*, when asked who opposed it? Echo only answers — *who?*

“Mr. Graves states (vol. ii. p. 469): ‘Their churches were scattered all over the Roman empire when Constantine came to the throne (A. D. 306, about 200 years after the Apostles). Constantine sought to unite them with the Catholics, but they obstinately refused to pollute their communion even at the command of the emperor, who then professed to be their friend.’ He is talking about Baptists or those holding to their distinctive principles. Were there any in existence in the time of Constantine? Would not Pelagius, Celestius, or Augustine, have heard of them, if they were all over the Roman empire at that period?”

“I think,” replied Anna, “that he claims some sects called (see vol. ii. pp. 466–469, and also diagram on p. 476) Cathari or Novatians, and Donatists. They were, I believe, nearly contemporary with the Emperor Constantine.”

“Why were they called by these names?” asked Halley. “Elder Mason, can you tell me why they were thus named, and in what respect they differed from other sects?”

“Really I do’nt know,” replied Elder Mason; “I suppose I have seen it some time, but I never trouble myself much about such matters.”

“The Novatians or Cathari were the followers of one Novatus, a presbyter of Carthage, who had disagreed with Cyprian, his bishop (about A. D. 250), and is said to have been ‘not only arrogant, factious, vain, and rash, but chargeable also with many offences and crimes.’ (See Mosheim, vol. i. p. 203, and n. 19): ‘Their peculiarity was (that is, of the sect) that they would not receive into the church persons who, *after being baptized, fell into greater sins.*’ Pedobaptists of our times would not differ very much from this. There is no evidence at all anywhere that they denied infant baptism.”

“And how was it with the Donatists, a little after this period, and in the age of Augustus?” asked Anna.

“There is no evidence that the schism which led to the formation of this sect,” answered Halley, “was in consequence of any dissension on doctrinal points. But, according to Moseheim, the immediate cause was in the election of Cecilian, the archdeacon, by a majority of the people and the clergy, to fill the chair vacated by the death of Mensurius, bishop of Carthage, A. D. 311. He was consecrated immediately, without waiting for the bishops of Numidia, by the bishops of the archdiocese of Carthage. The Numidian bishops were highly offended, and by the aid of the disaffected in Carthage deposed the newly-ordained bishop, and in his stead consecrated Majorinus as bishop of Carthage. The most violent and active among the Numidian bishops was Donatus, and therefore the whole party opposed to Cecilian were called *Donatists*. The quarrel spread far and wide, so that nearly every church in Africa was divided, and almost every city had two bishops. The matter was brought before Constantine in 313, and he referred it to the bishop of Rome, assisted by three bishops from Gaul. Cecilian was acquitted by this court. The Numidians were dissatisfied with his acquittal, and to quiet their murmurs the Emperor Constantine appointed a much larger tribunal (314) which also decided against the Donatists. They then appealed to the Emperor himself, who, on examination of the matter (316), decided against them; and on account of their contumely, reproaches, and complaints, he ordered their temples to be taken from them in Africa, and the seditious bishops to be banished.”

“But what has this to do with infant baptism?” asked Elder Clayton.

“I confess I do not know,” replied Halley. “They were acknowledged to be of the same doctrinal faith. Says the historian Gibbon, whom none can accuse of sectarian bias, and whose authority as an historian is unquestioned in regard to

facts, vol. i. ch. 21: 'Excluded from the civil and religious communion of mankind, they boldly excommunicated the rest of mankind who had embraced the impious party of Cecilian and of the Traditors. Bishops, virgins, and *even spotless INFANTS*, were subjected to the disgrace of a public penance before they could be admitted to the communion of the Donatists. But notwithstanding this irreconcilable aversion, the two parties, who were mixed and separated in all the cities of Africa, *had the same language and manners, the same zeal and learning, THE SAME FAITH AND WORSHIP.*' Mosheim, vol. i. p. 286, says: 'That the Donatists were sound in doctrine, even their adversaries admit.' It is a well-authenticated and established fact in history, that not only the Novatians and Donatists, but also the Arians, practised infant baptism. Augustine was the great opponent of the Donatists and the Arians a few years later, and he declared that none of *all* the Christians had any other opinion than that infant baptisms was useful and necessary. Now these very Donatists, whom all history declares to have had the *same faith and worship*, to have had the same church ordinances and usages which the other greater branch of the church had—whom all history assures us to have *practised infant baptism*, as the church had ever done—these Mr. Graves declares to have been Anabaptists—to have withdrawn from the so-called Catholic church, because *disgusted with its corruptions and innovations—that they refused to baptize their children*—that therefore they were persecuted and put to death, and that Augustine was one of the persecutors! (See THEODOSIA, vol. i. pp. 338-9). What a *dearth* of truth there is in these statements we may readily see from what has already been said. That they baptized all who came to them—even those coming from the other branch of the church, is unquestionable also. But why did they re-baptize them? It was not because they had not been immersed. It was not because they were baptized in infancy. It was not because they were sprinkled.

It was on no ground kindred to that of the Baptist faith and practice. And as Gibbon was neither Baptist nor Pedobaptist, I will quote from him, vol. i. chap. 21, that you may know the reason: 'They (the Donatists) asserted with confidence, and almost with exultation, that the apostolical succession was interrupted; that *all* the bishops of Europe and Asia were infected by the contagion of guilt and schism; and *that the prerogatives of the Catholic church were confined to the chosen portion of the African believers*, who alone had preserved inviolate the integrity of their faith and discipline. This rigid theory was supported by the most uncharitable conduct. Whenever they acquired a proselyte, even from the distant provinces of the East, they carefully repeated the sacred rites of baptism and ordination; as they rejected the validity of those which he had already received from the hands of heretics or schismatics. If they obtained possession of a church which had been used by their Catholic adversaries, they purified the unhallowed building with the same jealous care which a temple of idols might have required. They washed the pavement, scraped the walls, burnt the altar, which was commonly of wood, melted the consecrated plate, and cast the Holy Eucharist to the dogs, with every circumstance of ignominy which could provoke and perpetuate the animosity of religious factions. Notwithstanding this irreconcilable aversion, the two parties, who were mixed and separated in all the cities of Africa, had the same language and manners, the same zeal and learning, the same faith and worship.' Says Dr. Wall (vol. ii. p. 132): 'The challenge of Saint Augustine, and the confession of Pelagius, that they *never knew nor heard* of any heretics or schismatics that were *against the baptizing of infants*, must be an undeniable proof that neither of these two sects (Novatians and Donatists) were so; since a considerable body of each of them were remaining in those parts where these two men lived; and all their particular opinions were the subject of every day's disputation.' Mosheim

and Hase, in their Church Histories, fully corroborate what has already been said.

“Where then does Mr. Graves get his authority for the statements he has made with regard to the Donatists? Where? I ask, unless it be from a vivid imagination, — on which, as we have seen, — he has made demands before!

“We have now brought the examination down to the year A. D. 430 — more than 300 years after the death of the Apostles — and we have found infant baptism to be clearly the undisputed practice of the *whole church*. And we might add nearly in the words of Augustine: Will any one still ask for authority? ‘Will any one ask for divine authority in this matter?’ In ‘that which the *whole church practises*: ‘which was NOT *instituted by councils, but was ever in use?* It is very reasonably believed to be no other than a thing delivered by the authority of the Apostles. We may, besides, make a true estimate how much the sacrament of baptism does avail infants by the circumcision which God’s ancient people received.”

“We have also found that the Donatists who were contemporary with Augustine and Pelagius, were no Baptists, but *practised infant baptism*. Yet I confess,” continued Halley, after a moment’s hesitation, “if we look more closely, they did have *some* distinctive features, which are now peculiar to our Baptist brethren; and if you think them sufficiently strong to settle the relationship, we will pass this sect over to you.”

“What were those distinctive features?” asked Elder Mason, eagerly.

“They have been incidentally mentioned in the various quotations from the authorities cited. But I will repeat them. They were,” continued Halley, slowly, with a calm expressive gaze at Elder Mason, “a claim that they alone had the full right to be considered the *true and infallible church*; and to such intolerable malignity did they carry their resentment in their church relations, that they avoided all communication

with the Christian mother church; they not only shut out all intercourse, but pronounced the sacred rites and institutions of their mother church as *void of all virtue*, and some of them as *impious* and *sacrilegious*; in their bitterness and party zeal, they even carried their resentment and exclusiveness so far as to *re-baptize* those who joined them from other churches, and also to *re-ordain* those who already sustained the ministerial office. I have been able to trace no other resemblances."

A perceptible flush sprung up on the faces of many in the room, but it was more marked in the case of Elder Mason and Squire Tanner; and it seemed to deepen somewhat in the few moments of silence which followed. "I would like to call your attention now," continued Halley, turning over some old volumes which lay before him, "to the harmony of this testimony of the church fathers in regard to the practice of infant baptism in the early period of the church, and that which is found in the Catacombs of Rome. Here is a work by the Right Rev. Wm. J. Kip, D. D., wherein we find epitaphs and inscriptions similar to those we have already cited. Recollect that these Catacombs were inhabited by the early Christians during the persecutions of the church, *before* the time of Constantine (about two hundred years after the Apostles), and who was the first Christian emperor, and under whose reign Christians, *for the first time*, were protected by civil authority. Turn to the first volume of your text-book, Squire Tanner, p. 308, and you will find it there stated that during this period 'The church remained what Christ intended it should be. It was a body of professed believers. But when infants instead of converts began to be introduced, its whole character was changed. Its spirituality was gone. No Pagan, not even the tiger-hearted Nero himself, was so cruel in his persecutions of the Christians, as this body of baptized infants became, when it grew up to manhood and was invested with the power to kill.'

"But in these caves of the earth, to which these persecuted

Christians fled for safety, there are found enduring monuments of the faith and practice of these simple-hearted and persecuted men and women, who lived 'when the church was what Christ intended it to be;' and strange to relate, we are assured that even *then* it was composed in part of these very 'impiously baptized infants.' Not only are we assured of this by the distinguished bishops of the church who led their feeble, aggrieved, and oppressed flocks into these fortresses of the earth, and who themselves sealed their faith with their blood; but also the flocks themselves have left an imperishable record graven upon the eternal rocks, and which speak none the less forcibly and fatally to the Baptist cause. God, who can foresee all possible events, ever guards his truth, and fortifies it, so as to render it invincible. Here, through the lapse of ages, he has preserved to the world, relics and inscriptions made by Christians in that bloody time, when they were forced to go down into the earth to prolong life and to worship God. Let us now look again beneath the lifted veil, and be wiser.

"We here meet with numerous epitaphs of children who are called '*Neophytes*,' and '*Faithfuls*,' titles which, of course, could not have been given them unless they had been received *by baptism* into the church. The age at which they died precludes the idea that it was administered to them in any way but as infants. These epitaphs were carved, recollect, *less than two hundred years* after the Apostles. They are the rude monuments of those simple-hearted Christians in the primitive age of the church, ere she was corrupted by power. The ages of the children, who had been baptized, and made members of the church, and on whom was bestowed the title of *Neophyte* or *Faithful*, when they died, was from *less than two years* up to adult age; as may be seen by referring to those already noticed. *Seven* out of the eleven inscriptions, given in the examinations of yesterday, state that the child (though consecrated by baptism), was under four years of age when it died; and the oldest of the number was only eight years of age.

“Let us now for a few moments look at the force of the historical testimony we have been considering. Our Baptist brethren affirm that infant baptism was not an apostolic institution. We ask, then, how they account for these inscriptions of the primitive Christians? How do they account for, and interpret the hints and references to infant baptism in the writings of those who were even contemporary with the Apostles? Tertullian wrote in the first century after them, and he speaks of it as a generally existing practice: *where*, then, and *how*, was the change made? Where is the evidence of its introduction? Point us to a trace—even to the faintest trace of it. What declaration is there in any history or record of the times that infant baptism *began* to be practised in the churches? What suggestion or allusion is there, either in history or tradition, making it appear in any degree probable that such a change ever took place? For you to affirm that such a change was brought about without being able to point to a scrap of evidence favoring it, and still persist in affirming it in the face of every degree of probability against you, is, to say the least, an arrogant assumption instead of an argument. Pray tell us, where were our Baptist brethren when such a horrible heresy was being agitated and introduced? Why did they not, to a man, raise their voices and plead trumpet-tongued for its destruction? Were they all asleep when the church was teeming with such a dreadful error? Was there not *one* faithful enough to cry out against it, and to utter and record even one syllable against its *introduction*? There is not a syllable on the pages of history, sacred or profane, against its first appearance. Tertullian advocates *delay*, but admits it was in general use in his day. It is a popular tradition among our Baptist friends, and one they con over and over most fondly, that their denomination dates back to the time when John the Baptist began to ‘*immerse*’ professed believers in Jordan. If this be true, what became of them afterward? John and his disciples baptized

thousands, and these thousands probably baptized hundreds of thousands. Where were all these myriads when infant baptism was introduced? It seems to me that these people whom the Baptists claim as denominational ancestors, were very unlike them in sectarian zeal! If they had only possessed a small fraction of the vigilance and party spirit which characterize their brethren in these times, such an innovation could not have gained ground without exciting and arousing the whole church, and causing such opposition, that *volumes of controversy* would have been the result of the conflict, and the inheritance of their posterity. If there were Baptists then, why did they not lift up their hands, in pious horror, toward heaven, as they do now, and exclaim, This is '*sacrilege*'? Why did they not set themselves at work to array argument against it in such a manner as to clear their skirts of the guilt incurred? What means this ominous silence? Alas! alas! our Baptist brethren had either *ceased to be*, or had not as yet *BEGUN to be!*

"Although there is on record very ancient and particular accounts of heresies, and of controversies on a great variety of subjects, yet history is as silent as the grave about the heresy of Pedobaptists — yes, as silent as the grave!"

"Did not Tertullian lift up his voice of warning against it?" asked Elder Mason.

"Not against its introduction; not against it as an innovation; not against it as non-apostolic; not against it as not being of Divine authority! No: unfortunately, the only one in the Christian church for five hundred years or more, who ever opposed infant baptism in any way, believed and taught that infants ought to be baptized, *if in danger of death*; — and what infants are not? I would ask; — and he objected as much to the baptism of *unmarried believers*, as to that of infants, and that, too, from the same reason. You see, then, that the only object — or you can point to during all this period, was himself sadly infected with the heresy. But the testimony is not all negative

for its being an apostolic custom and ordinance. Far from it. We do not lack for witnesses of undoubted ability and veracity to prove that it was practised in the apostolic age, and also that it was handed down from them by their express order and command. Says Augustine: ‘They *minded the Scriptures*, and the authority of the *whole church*: infant baptism was *not* ordained by councils, but was ever in use. The custom of our mother the church in baptizing infants must not be disregarded, nor be accounted needless, *nor believed to be other than an order of the Apostles.*’

“Origen, who suffered for his faith, the son of a martyr, and the grandson and great-grandson of professing Christians, and living in the next century after the Apostles, declares: ‘*The church received an order from the Apostles to give baptism even to infants.*’ And for eleven hundred years after the ascension of our Lord and Savior, history does not record a single Christian sect on the face of the earth, which believed in or practised baptism at all, which rejected infant baptism, or even questioned it in any respect whatever.”

“For eleven hundred years!” exclaimed Anna, with surprise. “What was the name of that sect?”

“They were a small fraction of the Waldenses,” replied Halley, “led off in the twelfth century by one Peter de Bruys; and they rejected infant baptism on the plea that infants could not be saved under any circumstances whatever (see Dr. Wall, vol. ii. chap. 7), and therefore ought not to be baptized.”

“Peter de Bruys?” queried Anna. “Were they not called Petrobrusians?”

“They were,” replied Halley.

“Then Graves traces through them the Baptist church?” continued Anna. “But certainly that is not exactly Baptist faith, for they profess to believe that infants are saved.”

“No!” replied Halley, “they were not Baptists, for they taught that none could be saved but those who were able to

believe, and to work out their own salvation by a course of self-denial and labor; and as infants were incapable of thus believing, and working out their own salvation, according to their creed they must be lost. And it was not till the *sixteenth century* that infant baptism was opposed on any such grounds as are now urged by our Baptist friends. The very first sect of professing Christians on record in the history of the whole Christian world, which rejected infant baptism and believed in infant salvation, were the Anabaptists, starting up in Germany about the year 1522."

"That is a sweeping assertion, sir!" said Elder Mason, starting to his feet. "I'm sure it is easy to trace a line of Christian sects — under different names, it is true, but all rejecting infant baptism—up through the lapse of ages, even to the time of the Apostles."

"You say it is easy to trace back your ancestry to the time of the Apostles," replied Halley, very calmly and slowly; "if so, meet me here to-morrow, and I will measure histories with you. I do not ask or expect you to take my bare assertions for historical evidences. There is an abundance of truth on the subject, faithful and complete. To-morrow, then, if there is no objection, we will trace back the lineage of our Baptist friends, and decide for ourselves whether they are legitimate or spurious in their claims to apostolic heirship."

A look of excited interest passed round the room. "I wish to-morrow were here," said Squire Tanner. "And I must confess, if this hook fails me, I am no longer a Baptist."

"I trust, then," said Anna, while tears of joy for the moment dimmed her eyes, and an emotion of deep gratitude stirred the depths of her soul, "I trust, Squire Tanner, that to-morrow, at this hour, the power of God's invincible Truth will have swept away human-drawn lines and distinctions, and that you will be ready then to lift up your eyes to God, our Heavenly Father, and to ask in penitence and sincerity, 'Who is

my brother?’ Just so surely as you do, Squire Tanner, you will hear the still small voice of God’s Spirit whispering within you, ‘I have given you my *witness*, even the Spirit of truth; He shall testify of me. Look around you. Mark those who bring forth the fruits of the Spirit. Those are by the Spirit sealed unto the day of redemption—that seal is mine. Behold your brother! One is your Master, even God your Savior, and *all ye are brethren*; and remember I have told you, By this may ye know that ye have passed from death unto life, *that ye love one another—that ye love the brethren.*’”

Elder Clayton’s eyes were fixed on Anna’s eloquent and impassioned face, and her words stirred with strange power in his soul, half-forgotten memories of the past. After all had passed out and left him alone, he still remained motionless in his seat; his eyes resting apparently on the door which closed after the last retiring form; and, communing with his own spirit, he reasoned with himself. He pondered over the words of his Master—“A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another as I have loved you.” As I have loved you! What a measure of love was that! Who can meet the requirements of this new commandment? And then, like a dark shadow, there hovered over his mind an unwelcome memory of *how some Christians are taught to love one another*. The point to which his memory clung with so much tenacity was not many months in the past. It was a certain time when Father Longwind drew him, with an air of mystery, into his study, and there taking a book from his valise, said: “Brother Clayton, here is one of the most wonderful productions of the age! It’s a gem, I assure you! But you see I do’n’t think it *expedient* to circulate it too freely, just now, as we have found that public opinion is not yet ripe for it! You had better read it, and I assure you that you will find your faith very much strengthened.” Brother Clayton read it. Father Longwind was mistaken in the result; his faith was not strengthened, but

shaken, even to its foundation. Ever since then he had been trying to get those frightful shadows out of his mind. He had not yet succeeded: at this moment they hung around him like so many haunting spectres. At length, as he sat there, his thoughts assumed the form of an argument; and he discussed the question *pro* and *con* as best he could.

“Are there not *brethren* out of the Baptist church? Yet I am assured by that work that all Pedobaptists are but ‘harlots and abominations,’ and hence we are taught that it is our duty ‘to refuse to receive and to recognize their claims as Christian churches, to receive their ordinances, or recognize their preachers as official gospel ministers, by inviting them into our pulpits.’” (See “Great Iron Wheel, or Methodism shown to be Republicanism Backwards, and Christianity Reversed;” by J. R. Graves, Editor of Tennessee Baptist, p. 30).

“What show of divine favor can *we* urge that God does not bestow upon other evangelical denominations?” still urged the better nature of the man. “Are revivals amongst us more frequent and extensive? Do we exhibit more of the fruits of the Spirit; and does God bless *our labors alone* to the salvation of sinners?”

The shadow of Mr. Graves answered again: “The world should know that all the ten or twelve so-called evangelical yet conflicting denominations, *cannot be the churches of Christ*” (Great Iron Wheel, p. 16).

“Cannot be?” mused the good man. “But was there ever a more devoted, sincere, and spiritually-minded Christian than Father Benjamine, ready in every good word and work? Yet he is a Methodist. I would to-day be glad to exchange my chances for heaven with him, for I know that God loves this faithful old servant.”

“He is the follower of a mere human, man-devised system,” said the shadow, sternly. “A rival fold whose very being and advancement is hostile to, and subversive of the church and

kingdom of Christ. * * * What an awful thought for an aged man about to die, that he has spent his long life and exhausted all his mighty powers of mind and body, in opposing the kingdom of Christ, and diverting those seeking to enter it into a rival organization which, becoming universal, would blot out the doctrines, constitution, and very being of Christ's church from the world" (Great Iron Wheel, p. 13).

"It is false!" said Elder Clayton to himself, his better nature revolting at the thought. "Father Benjamine has not labored in 'a rival fold,' but in his Master's vineyard. His prayers and exhortations have arrested many in the course of sin, and brought them out from the kingdom of Satan into the church of Christ, and into the kingdom of our Lord; for they are to-day consistent, believing, and active Christians."

"A Methodist, a workman in the vineyard of the Lord!" exclaimed the shadow. "Their creed is a mass of doctrinal corruption and putrefaction. Call you such sentiments Protestantism? Call you such teachings evangelical? Call you such doctrines Christianity? They are the inversion and perversion of Christianity!" (Great Iron Wheel, p. 426). "The Gospel tells us that the Methodist System is *Antichrist*, for it is the very identical priestly power which has crushed and trodden under foot the liberty wherewith Christ doth make us free in every age of the world." (p. 162). "Methodism," continued the shadow, growing bolder at the stupor of surprise with which his assertions were received; "Methodism is a human scheme of man's device and invention—a man-made institution—as much so as that of Odd-Fellowship or Masonry—an imperfect and defective organization. How can a Christian man dare to fellowship it as a Scriptural body; much less prefer it to the church as organized by our blessed Savior? It is a rival of Christ's fold, and those who enter it *leave Christ to follow men*—become the followers of Wesley, and the servants of the General Conference. * * * In what light must

we regard the baptism and ordination of Methodist ministers? They have, one and all, received their ordination and authority from Rome—the mystical Babylon—the ‘man of sin,’ and son of perdition — through the Church of England! * * * Shall we now, without either a stake or a prison in view, *repudiate the principles and practices of our martyred ancestors* by recognizing the man-called (for it is evident that God never called man to preach Methodism), and man-made preachers of your *human societies*, by inviting them into our pulpits and thus saying to the world, These are Christ’s ministers, hear ye them; when they are only Mr. Wesley’s preachers? You cannot expect the reflecting and consistent of my (Baptist) brethren to act thus!” (Great Iron Wheel, pp. 64, 65).

“Merciful Father! Is that what I have professed to believe?” exclaimed the old man, with a start like one awaking from an unpleasant dream, and as tears coursed now and then down his time-furrowed cheeks. “May God help me to love my brethren! Are there no brethren out of the Baptist church? Is there not a Methodist or Presbyterian Christian? Is there no Pedobaptist Christian? If there *is*, we are assured by the Great Head of the Church that he is a member of Christ’s family—he is *my brother*. He is of that *one fold*, and over us both is *one Shepherd*—Christ Jesus! Dare I thus hurl anathemas at one of that God-loved and blood-bought throng? ‘*Inasmuch as ye have done it unto THE LEAST OF THESE, ye have done it unto me.*’ Was not that the declaration of the Great Judge of all the earth? And shall not I hear that sentence proclaimed one day as I stand before the Great White Throne at the coming judgment? Here lies the gist of the whole question—is there a *Christian* among them? Will God sanction and accept, by the bestowal of his Spirit, what is ‘impious’ in his sight? Will he accept ‘sacrilege?’ God forgive me! If there is a Christian in a Pedobaptist church, and if their faith is what *we* are taught it is, God approves, accepts, and

bleses, ay, and saves the 'sacrilegious' and the 'impious.' Will God countenance that which he denominates in his word 'an abomination' to him? The thought is almost blasphemy! God forgive the thought, but if he will not approve of what is to him an abomination, and *these charges be true*—then there is not a Christian in a Pedobaptist church! not one!—Anna; Anna, my child, come to me, Anna!”

The kind old man was writhing in mental agony. The conscious truth had broke in upon his mind with something of that force, with which it will burst upon every soul standing in the light of eternity.

“Anna, tell me; am I wild, or is it true that I have belonged for *twenty years* to a sect that is seeking to unchristianize all the rest of the world?”

“Father, what do you mean—what is the matter?”

“Why, Anna, I read a book not long since, written by one of the most prominent men in our church, and every page has since haunted me like a ghostly shadow! Is there no church but the Baptist church? Are all other doctrines 'impious,' all other churches 'Antichrist,' and the 'man of sin'?”

“I know to what work you refer, father; I read it. And although it is conceded that there may be *some* Christians out of the Baptist church, yet that concession is inconsistent with the position taken; and if that position is true and just, and there be truth in the word of God, every Pedobaptist must be lost.”

“Anna!”

“I repeat it, father; if the position taken by Mr. Graves in the 'Great Iron Wheel' is true, and God's word is true, every Pedobaptist must be lost. He says that 'all Pedobaptist societies are human, man-devised systems, rival folds, hostile to the church of Christ; that they are Antichrist.' Jesus said: 'He that is not for me is against me: and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad. Ye cannot serve God and Mammon.'”

If, then, Pedobaptists are Antichrist, they are against Christ, and whom do they serve?

“Graves says that ‘Pedobaptist societies are rivals of the fold of Christ, and those who enter them leave Christ to follow men.’

“Jesus says: ‘My sheep hear my voice, and they *follow me*; and a stranger will they *not follow*, but will flee from him.’ Therefore Pedobaptists are the servants of the devil and must perish. Graves says (pp. 48–9): ‘The great stone cut out without hands which is to fill the whole earth, is the Close Communion Baptist church.’ This Baptist church is to crush out all ‘pedobaptist societies and the kingdoms of the earth;’ but will God crush out his own family? No! every one of them is precious in his sight, and he loves them; therefore he has not a child out of the Baptist church. He says, further, that the woman, spoken of in Revelations, on whose forehead ‘was a name written, Mystery, Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth, is Popery, and that the various Pedobaptist sects are her daughters, and denominated in the above passage “harlots and abominations;” and that they with the drunken mother, constitute Babylon’ (Great Iron Wheel, pp. 30–31). Saith the word of God: ‘Babylon the Great is fallen, is fallen; and is become the habitations of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage for every unclean and hateful bird. Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine, and she shall be utterly burned with fire.’ Graves says——

“O, Anna, Anna, spare me! Is this what I have professed to believe, and labored to support for twenty years? God knows I never believed it—never! I never—you know, my child, I never taught it! It was a sin of *ignorance*, for I really did not know what I professed to believe. Since you have been speaking, Anna, I have been thinking of some Pedobaptists in my boyhood. Yes, it seems to me that I can see her now—even now, dying!”

“Who? father — who?”

“The one God gave to me in the place of a mother—a godly woman. Six children I saw her bear in her arms to God’s altar, and there consecrate them to his service. The entire six stood around her bed-side, born of the Spirit, though sorrowing in view of their earthly loss, yet rejoicing in the hope of coming glory! I was there, too, an orphan, cast upon their bounty, but yet ‘in the gall of bitterness and bonds of iniquity,’ my sins unforgiven. I then for the first time witnessed how Christian faith can triumph over the agonies of death — how fearlessly a soul, washed in the blood of the Savior, can trust itself in the arms of its God when all human help is unavailing. For a time before her spirit left the frail tenement of clay, there was ‘glory begun’ in her soul. ‘Hark!’ she would exclaim in broken whispers, ‘hear the angels chanting! Listen, children —listen! They wait for me—they call me home to heaven! There is only one pang more,’ she said, after a dreadful spasm, and seeing her children weeping around her, ‘only one pang more, and then—joy—peace—life and light eternal.’ Her eyes rested on me the last time they opened on earth, and she faintly whispered, ‘meet me — meet me in heaven!’ That look gave me no rest till I found it in Jesus. No. It haunted me for weeks, day and night, till my sin-burdened soul groaned beneath its heavy load, and I was ready to cast myself at the foot of the cross, and cry, ‘God be merciful unto me, a sinner. Lord, I believe, help my unbelief!’ Then relief came, and I was found sitting in my right mind at the feet of Jesus.”

“And yet,” said Anna, “we are taught in that work that all Pedobaptists — such even as your sainted foster-mother — received the mark of the *beast* in their foreheads when *sprinkled*. God saith: ‘If any man receive his mark (the *beast*’s) in his forehead or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation, and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and

in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever, and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the *mark* of his name.' Thus, Mr. Graves, by his position, virtually condemns irrevocably all Pedobaptists to eternal perdition."

"O, Anna, is it possible!"

"It is not only the position taken by Mr. Graves, but by others of our Baptist brethren also — and the world ought to know it. I have heard it, father, from a Baptist minister, and in a Baptist pulpit!"

"When, my child, and from whom?"

"But a few weeks ago, when you were absent, and Elder F —— filled your pulpit, and preached from these words: 'Buried with Christ in baptism.' He, in the course of his discourse, referred to the passage from Revelation which I quoted, and plainly and distinctly stated that '*Sprinkling was the mark of the beast*;' and he even repeated it! Why should we seek to cloak it, when others publish it in books and tracts innumerable; and scatter them broad-cast all over the land; and even encompass earth and sea to make one proselyte to their faith? Why — when they publish it boldly from the sacred desk? If any one doubts this, let him examine their publications and listen to their sermons, and then judge them from their own works, and their own mouths."

"But it is not so with all, Anna — you know it is not."

"True, father, the great body of the Baptist church are living, active Christians. They are sincere in their beliefs and practices, though blinded and misled, in regard to their peculiar faith, by those who permit their party spirit and sectarian zeal to sway them in all their actions, to embitter all their writings, and to overlook and neglect their Master's cause in advocating their own.

'Faith — fanatic faith, once wedded fast,
To some dear falsehood, hugs it to the last.'

CHAPTER XII.

“Gather the rosebuds while ye may,
Old Time is still a-flying,
And that same flower that blooms to-day,
To-morrow shall be dying.”

“The night is mother of the day, the winter of the spring,
And ever upon old decay the greenest mosses cling.
Behind the cloud the starlight lurks, thro’ showers the sunbeams fall,
For God, who loveth all his works, hath left his hope with all.”

“Then nerve thy spirit to the proof,
And blench not at thy chosen lot;
The timid good may stand aloof,
The sage may frown—yet faint thou not,
Nor heed the shaft too surely cast,
The foul and hissing bolt of scorn;
For with thy side shall dwell, at last,
The victory of endurance born.”

ON the morrow there was an excited throng at Elder Clayton's. The study was filled long before the hour, and still they were coming. Elder Clayton, in view of the gathering numbers, said: “My friends, we have better accommodations for you below. I think we can there find seats for you all.” They were soon seated in their new quarters, and ready for the business of the day. There seemed a deep interest on the part of all.

“What are your claims, Elder Mason?” asked Halley.
“Will you please give us a statement?”

“Baptists believe,” said Elder Mason, clearing his throat

with conscious dignity, "that they alone have existed as pure communities of Christians from the day of Christ's ascension until now (Great Iron Wheel, p. 567). They alone, of all religious sects, have suffered the cruel persecutions of the beast for 1260 years, and consequently they believe themselves to be the kingdom which Christ came to set up, that must stand forever, despite the malice or powers of hell."

"A modest claim!" muttered Elder Clayton, with a look of half-mingled contempt and pity.

"You claim, then, in the first place," said Halley, "that you alone have existed as *pure Christian communities* down through 1800 years. Now before we proceed further, it will be necessary for us to understand what you consider a 'pure community of Christians;' then we shall be ready to investigate your claims. You hold, I suppose, that the Baptist church *now* is a pure Christian community?"

"Yes, certainly; the Baptist church is pure in doctrine, forms, and discipline."

"We are then to understand you, that there have been communities or churches like yours, in doctrine, forms, and discipline, in existence—an unbroken chain—from the time of our Savior down to the present?"

"Certainly, that is what we claim."

"And, secondly," continued Halley; "you claim that these pure communities or churches like yours, in doctrine, forms, and discipline, have alone suffered the persecutions of the beast, and consequently consider yourselves the kingdom Christ came to set up?"

"That is precisely our belief, sir."

"May I ask now what the names of those sects are through which you trace your lineage?"

"Their names?" replied Elder Mason. "They are well known to history, sir. They are called (THEODOSIA ERNEST, vol. i. p. 339) Donatists, Novatianists, Cathari or Puritans,

Paulicians, Henricans, Petrobrusians, Mennonites, Albigenses, Waldenses, etc.”

“And Baptists, I suppose, you would add.”

“Yes, sir, certainly, that is understood.”

“Then we will begin with the Baptists,” continued Halley, “and trace back the ancestry. From what sect, and when, do you date the present organization? How long has the Baptist church existed under its present name?”

“It was of English birth, sir, some time in the seventeenth century.”

“I have no reason to differ from you on that statement; still, for the satisfaction of those present, I will read the authority—we will have the historical proofs. In the *Encyclopedia Americana*, it is stated: ‘We may date the first public acknowledgment of the Baptists as distinct from the Anabaptists, from their petition to Parliament, in 1620. In 1623 they are described as carrying an external appearance of holiness, as denying the doctrines of predestination, reprobation, etc. It is probable, therefore, that the Baptists of that time were *General Baptists*. The year 1633 provides us with the earliest records remaining, of the formation of a Particular Baptist church in London.’

“Dr. Murdock, in his translation of Mosheim’s *Church History*, gives a more particular account of the matter in a note on p. 473, vol. iii. I will read this also. ‘The *first* regular congregation of English Baptists appears to have originated from certain English Puritans, who returned from Holland after the death of their pastor, Rev. John Smith, who died in 1610. These were the General or Arminian Baptists, and may be supposed to have derived many of their opinions from the Mennonites. From this time onward, churches of General Baptists were formed here and there in different parts of England. But in general they made no great figure, and do not appear to have had much connection, or to have professed one uniform faith.

The Particular or Calvinistic Baptists trace their origin to a congregation of INDEPENDENTS, established in London in the year 1616. This congregation having become very large, and some of them differing from the others on the subject of infant baptism, they agreed to divide. Those who disbelieved in infant baptism were regularly dismissed in 1633, and formed into a new church under the Rev. John Spilsbury. In 1638 several more members were dismissed to Mr. Spilsbury's church. And in 1639 a new Baptist church was formed. Now churches of Particular Baptists multiplied rapidly."

"It seems to me," said Anna, "that we have already come to a break in the lineage. The very first Calvinistic or Close Communion Baptist church on record was regularly set off, or dismissed from an *Independent* or *Congregational* church! What further need we say? After all, then, Elder Mason, you and Mr. Graves are both off-shoots from our time-honored Congregational brethren! You ought to be proud of this discovery, for thereby you establish a nobler and purer ancestry than that claimed by Mr. Graves and others of your denomination. What can we do now but take the parent stock, the Independents, and trace them to their origin?"

"I am sure," said Elder Mason, "that Dr. Murdock states that the first congregation of English Baptists originated from certain Puritans who returned from Holland, and that they derived their principles from the Mennonites."

"And adds, moreover," replied Halley, "that they were the Arminian or General (*i. e.* Free-Will) Baptists. Are their doctrines the ones we are tracing? Do you hold that *open communion* is a distinguishing feature of a 'pure community of Christ?' Remember we are tracing not the *name* Baptist, but 'those pure doctrines, forms and discipline' now peculiar to our Close Communion Baptist brethren. Whither then, Elder Mason, shall we go now to get a trace of them?"

"Arminian Baptists," he replied, "agree with us in the

form of baptism, and also in rejecting infant baptism. Those may be called the distinguishing characteristics of our brethren in all ages of the world.”

“Then give up your Close Communion. If that is not *essential* to a ‘pure community of Christ,’ why do you retain it? If there has ever been in existence a ‘pure community’ which held to, and practised Open Communion, that doctrine is *pure still*; and Close Communion is *impure*, and you have rendered yourselves unworthy of your lineage. Dr. Murdock adds: ‘Before the erection of regular Baptist congregations, and indeed for some time after, it was very common for Baptists and others to belong to the same church, and to worship and commune together.’ Was that right? If it was, why do you not now throw open your hearts and the Lord’s table to your brethren? If that was wrong, how happens it that a *pure* stream flows from an *impure fountain*? Let me ask in the words of our Savior: ‘Can a fountain at the same time send forth sweet waters and bitter?’”

“How is it with regard to the second claim?” asked Squire Tanner. “Whom did the ‘beast persecute in those days?’”

“Dr. Murdock further remarks in the same connection,” replied Halley: “On the restoration of Charles II., in 1660, the Baptists, *with all other nonconformists*, were exposed to great troubles and persecutions; and at the close of the revolution in 1688, they, as well as the other dissenters, obtained free toleration.’”

“Then they fared pretty much all alike when they communed together,” said Squire Tanner. “But if they had set themselves up as something better and holier than all the rest of the world, and thus rendered themselves exclusives, I do’nt know how they could consistently complain if they got *exclusive fare*.”

“What are we to do now?” urged Halley. “Do you, Elder Mason, resign your position first taken, ‘That there has been

in existence for 1800 years a community like yours in doctrine, forms, and discipline?"

"No, sir! I do't think it is necessary that they should be *identical in every minute respect*. It is sufficient that they agree in the grand fundamental principles. All Baptists are Baptists; and we are clearly descended from the Mennonites. I see nothing in the way of our progress."

"But hold! You say that all Baptists are Baptists — grant it; but do you intend us to understand from that, that all Baptist churches are *pure churches*, and that you recognize them as such? Where, then, is your communion-table? Why do you shut out a large part of your own brethren—a part of the 'pure churches of Christ'—from the ordinances of the Lord's house? If merely the form of immersion, and the rejection of infant baptism, render a sect 'the pure community of Christ,' wherein are you better than the Free-Will, the Six-Principled, and the Seventh-Day Baptists, or the Tunkers, Emancipators, Rogerenes, Mennonites, etc.? How happens it that the house is divided against itself? Says Graves (Great Iron Wheel, p. 23): 'Divided and warring among themselves—if they are indeed of one household, they cannot stand. The friendly alien is astonished and offended—skeptics laugh, and devils rejoice!' I call your attention to this point, for it is well worthy your consideration; and again, in the language of Graves, would exclaim, 'This subject is too grave, too momentous for trifling!' We are to understand you then, Elder Mason, that all Baptists, of whatever name beside, are, if they reject infant baptism and practise immersion, *pure and regular Baptists?*"

"No, sir! I do not change my position. I have no doubt that it can be proved from history, that Calvinistic Baptists are the regular descendants of the Mennonites, and they from the Waldenses, etc."

"Well, sir, we are all attention. Where is your proof?"

"I think we can tell by examining the principles of the

Mennonites. If their faith is like ours, or similar to it, we may justly claim them in our lineage.”

“Very well, sir, we will make the examination; but first, if you please, let me produce another Church History, by Dr. Charles Hase, Prof. of Theology in the University of Jena, Germany. I will read his testimony regarding the origin of the English Baptists. He says, p. 610: ‘The Baptists of England and North America had their origin *principally among the INDEPENDENTS SINCE 1630.* The largest portion adhere strictly to Calvinistic orthodoxy and discipline; but a part are Arminians (General Baptists), and some have no ecclesiastical discipline.’ Here, then, is your parentage! I should very much like to see you, Elder Mason, bring history to prove that you are a legitimate descendant of the Mennonites or Anabaptists. I desire you to get back at least *one* century more toward the Apostles. You are yet over 1600 years off, and have come to a break — an impassable dike — no connection to be made in a *regular* line now!

“But we will willingly come to your assistance, and, by a change of tactics, endeavor to aid you to take *one* more step tending toward an ‘apostolical succession!’ Let us then, as you desire, examine the principles of the Mennonites; and here is an exposition of them by Dr. Mosheim.”

“Who was Mosheim?” asked Elder Clayton.

“He was a German. He was born in 1694. His favorite pursuits were pulpit eloquence, biblical and historical theology, and practical religion. His education was completed at the University of Kiel, where at an early age he became professor of philosophy. The King of Denmark invited him to a professorship at Copenhagen. Soon after (1725), the Duke of Brunswick called him to the Divinity chair at Helmstadt, which he filled with great credit twenty-two years. Says Dr. Murdock: ‘In 1747, when George II., King of England, the founder of the University of Gottingen, wished to place over

that institution men of the highest rank in the literary world, Dr. Mosheim was decreed worthy to be its chancellor, and the head of the department of theology. In this honorable station he remained eight years, or till his death, Sept. 9, 1755.' Schlegel, Schroeck, Warburton, and others, speak in the highest terms of him as a church historian. He is called the first *real* modern historian of the church. His work is a standard one. Graves, speaking of him in connection with the history of the Baptists, says: 'He was conversant with all the facts' (Great Iron Wheel, p. 570). Let us see, then, what Dr. Mosheim says (p. 212, ss. vol. iii.): 'All the opinions which are common to the body of the Mennonites are founded on this one principle as their basis, namely, that the kingdom which Christ has established on earth, or the church, is a visible society or company in which is no place for any but holy or pious persons ("That's it!" exclaimed Elder Mason; "I told you we should find them alike!"), and which therefore has none of those institutions and provisions which human sagacity has devised for the benefit of the ungodly. This principle was frankly avowed by the ancestors of the Mennonites; but the moderns, in their confessions, either cover it up under words of dubious import, or appear to reject it; yet they cannot actually reject it, or cannot unless they would be inconsistent, and would deprive their doctrines of their *natural* basis. But in regard to the most modern Mennonites (about 1725), as they have departed in very many things from the views and the institutions of their fathers, so they have abandoned nearly altogether this principle respecting the nature of the Christian church. * * Nevertheless, from the doctrines of the old Anabaptists respecting the church flow the principles and opinions by which they (Mennonites) are distinguished from other Christians. This doctrine requires, I. That they should receive none into their church by the sacrament of baptism unless they are adults, and have the full use of their reason. Because it

is uncertain with regard to infants whether they will become pious or irreligious; neither can they pledge their faith to the church to lead a holy life. ("I told you they were the regular Baptists — *the* Baptists!" said Elder Mason, scarcely able to restrain himself from expressions of joy.) It requires: II. That they should not admit of magistrates, nor suffer any of their members to perform the functions of a magistrate. Because where there are no bad men, there can be no need of magistrates. (Elder Mason's countenance began to lengthen.) III. It requires, that they should deny the justice of repelling force by force, or of waging war. Because as they who are *perfectly holy* cannot be provoked by injuries, nor commit them, so they have no need of the support of arms in order to their safety. IV. It requires, that they should have strong aversion to all penalties and punishments, and especially to capital punishments. Because punishments are aimed at the wickedness and the crimes of men, but the church of Christ is free from all crimes and wickedness. V. It forbids the calling of God to witness any transaction, or the confirming anything by an oath. Because minds that are actuated solely by a love of what is good and right, never violate their faith, nor dissemble the truth. From this doctrine follows likewise the VI. Which has reference to the severe and rigid discipline of the old Anabaptists, which produced so many commotions among them.' Here, on p. 215, says Dr. Mosheim: III. 'The more rigid Mennonites hold, that all excommunicated persons are to be shunned as if they were pests, and are to be deprived of all social intercourse. Hence the ties of kindred must be severed, and the voice of nature must be unheeded. Between parents and their children, husbands and their wives, there must be *no kind looks, no conversation, no manifestation of affection, and no kind offices*, when the church has once pronounced them unworthy of her communion. IV. That the example of Christ, which has in this instance the force of a law, requires

his disciples to wash the feet of their guests in token of their love.' These more rigid Mennonites are called the stricter ('fine, or more rigid,' p. 210) Baptists; and you profess to be of that class, Elder Mason. Do you endorse and put in practice these principles? Have you ever washed the feet of your brethren? Do you profess to be of pure stock, to have descended from pure churches, and yet repudiate the doctrines and practices of your ancestry?

"But again: Dr. Mosheim (p. 218), says, in tracing the resemblance between the doctrines of the Mennonites and the *Particular* Baptists of his day: I. 'Like the ancient Mennonites they regard their own church as being the only true church of Christ, and most carefully avoid connection with all other religious communities. II. They immerse candidates for baptism only *once*, and not three times ("Ah! they are our ancestors!" exclaimed Elder Mason. "We have found them now!")—and they esteem it unessential whether new converts be baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or only in the name of Jesus. IV. Many of them adopt Menno's opinion respecting the origin of Christ's body. V. They consider the decrees of the Apostles (Acts xv. 25), respecting blood and things strangled to be a law binding on the church universal. VI. They believe that the soul, between death and the resurrection at the last day, has neither pleasure nor pain, but is in a state of insensibility. VII. They use extreme unction. VIII. Some of them, in addition to the Lord's day or Sunday, keep also the Jewish Sabbath. I omit the notice of minor points. These Baptists have *bishops*, and *presbyters*, and *deacons*.' Do you claim them as identical with your denomination, Elder Mason?"

"In many points we agree," he replied, "and sufficiently so, I think, to establish a parentage."

"In many points you do, I concede. But were they identical with you in *doctrines*, *forms*, and *discipline*? If they were

not, how can they be a pure church of Christ? Or granting them pure, and you differing from them, how can *you* be a pure church?"

"What was the connection between the Anabaptists and the Mennonites?" asked Anna.

"We will let Mosheim answer that question," replied Halley. "He states (vol. iii. p. 140): 'The infancy of the new church was disturbed by a sect of delirious fanatics, who turned the world upside-down, and who imagined that they were moved by a divine afflatus to set up a new kingdom of Christ, free from all sin. * * The worst members of this motley company constituted that seditious band which produced the rustic war (Peasants' war) in Germany, and also that which disturbed Westphalia, and settled itself in Munster. While the better members, terrified by the miseries and slaughter of their companions, joined themselves at last to a sect called Mennonites.'

"Dr. Charles Hase, in his Church History, p. 431, says: 'While the Reformers justified their opposition to the Papacy by appealing to the Scriptures, or to clear and manifest reasons, it was not surprising that others on the contrary, decidedly arrogated to themselves as individuals, what the church claimed for herself in general, and that fanatical persons mistook their own passionate impulses for divine inspiration. * * These Anabaptists who made their *first appearance* at Zwickau and Wittenberg (1521), were nearly all put to death in the Peasants' war, but in almost every part of the country a class of enthusiasts resembling them, but very unlike each other in moral and religious character, became the pioneers and freebooters of the Reformation.'

"It seems, then," said Anna, "that Anabaptist was the general or generic name common to them all, and that the Mennonites were a branch, which Mosheim denominates the better part of them. But is nothing known, with any certainty, of their origin?"

“Mosheim says, in regard to that, p. 198: ‘The origin of the sect, who from their repetition of the baptism received in other communities, are called Anabaptists, but who are also denominated Mennonites from the celebrated man to whom they owe a large share of their present prosperity, is involved in much obscurity. For they suddenly started up in various countries of Europe, under the influence of leaders of dissimilar characters and views, and at the same time when the first contests with the Catholics so distracted the attention of all, that they scarcely noticed any other passing occurrences.’ And on p. 202: ‘In my opinion this only can be affirmed, that at one and the same time, that is, *not long after the commencement of the reformation by Luther*, there arose men of this sort in several different countries. This may be inferred from the fact, that the first leaders of any note among the Anabaptists, were nearly all founders of *different sects*.’”

“Now you see,” said Elder Mason, “that it is clearly established that the Mennonites as a sect of the Anabaptists are in our line of ancestors.”

“I do not see it all as yet, Elder Mason; for you have not even shown that the *Anabaptists* are *your* ancestors. Still I never once doubted that they suggested and gave birth to some of your peculiar doctrines; but I do doubt whether you can point to the time when any one church ceased to be called Mennonites, and thereupon received the name of Calvinistic Baptists. And this being the case, how do you know that the ordinances were handed from them to you? Where is your *regular succession*’?”

“Nevertheless, said Elder Mason, “we claim that the Anabaptists, on account of their rejection of infant baptism and their practice of immersion—yes, and Communion, too, for they would not commune with other sects—were identical with us. The Mennonites, however, as a distinct order of the Anabaptists, more nearly resemble us.”

“I cannot concede you the point just yet,” said Halley. “I am going to quote your own favorite author. Turn to ‘Great Iron Wheel,’ p. 568: there Mr. Graves, tracing the history of the Baptist church—which seems in most, or all of his works, to have troubled him very much—quotes from the Preface of Orchard’s History of Foreign Baptists: ‘They (Pedobaptists) allege that the mad men of Munster were Baptists, and that Baptists as such were the authors of the rebellion, and all the excesses of that period, and they point us to Munster, when we speak of our origin and history, and sneeringly say, There was your origin, and that your early history.’ But brother Graves disowns this ancestry here, and in his repudiation of them, says: ‘In vindication, we point them to the pages of Merle D’Aubigne: he says, On one point it seems necessary to guard against misapprehension. Some persons imagine that the Anabaptists of the time of the Reformation, and the Baptists of our day, are the same. But they are as different as possible.’ He then refers to Fessenden’s Encyclopædia: ‘The English and Dutch Baptists do not consider the word (Anabaptist) as at all applicable to their sect. It is but justice to observe, that the Baptists of Holland, England, and the United States, are to be essentially distinct from those seditious and fanatical individuals above mentioned, as they profess an equal aversion to all principles of rebellion of the one, and enthusiasm of the other.’”

“Do you say that Graves makes those quotations and statements?” asked Elder Mason, with a flushed face and an exceedingly embarrassed air.

“He does,” replied Halley; “and that, too, in a direct effort to prove that such claims as you are endeavoring to enforce here to-day, and which I have not yet granted you, are *false charges* urged by your enemies to your hurt! Desist, I beg of you, Elder Mason, in the name of Graves, desist! But to show you what consistency there is in Mr. Graves’ statements, I will

make a few more quotations. In THEODOSIA ERNEST, vol. i. pp. 168, 169, he repeats what has already been quoted from him in the Great Iron Wheel, and then on p. 172, he quotes as the highest reliable authority: '*We have now seen that the BAPTISTS who were FORMERLY CALLED ANABAPTISTS, and, in later times, Mennonites, were the original Waldenses, etc.*'

"Immediately after having repudiated them to evade the odium of their crimes, Mr. Graves, in order to make it appear that his denomination is of great antiquity, and to put them in as a connecting link, acknowledges them as Baptist brethren and endorses all statements to that effect! And in vol. ii. p. 418, he says, that Munzer—the noted leader of the fanatical Anabaptists—was a Baptist minister, and that Luther was exasperated at the number of his converts (the Anabaptists of course) to the Baptist faith—that is, to the faith of the Anabaptists, for all his followers were Anabaptists, and in general, the worst phase in which they have ever manifested themselves to the world. Thus after indignantly vindicating the Baptists from the charge of being in *any way* allied to the Anabaptists, he in the same connection nearly, declares them to be the same. And so it is in the Great Iron Wheel, p. 568. He presents two sets of arguments; although one is directly opposed to, and destroys, virtually, the other; still, as he discovers that it might be *expedient* to have them both on hand for different occasions—that is, if there is anything to be gained by a denial of all connection with these German fanatics, then he quotes his authorities to that effect; but on the other hand, if circumstances arise, like the present, then, in order to make a connection, it is absolutely necessary to recognize them in some general non-committal way—or in more definite terms, perhaps! All this he does, apparently, without the least hesitation or compunctions of conscience! But, Elder Mason, what position do you take? It is impossible for us to proceed with both. Do you claim, or repudiate, your ancestry?"

“I do not change my position, sir, if other people do,” replied Elder Mason, rather pertly. “I shall maintain that we trace our origin through the Mennonites and Anabaptists!”

“Yes, that is proper on an occasion like this,” responded Halley, with the least perceptible curl of the lip. “Very well, then, let us look after the character of this *pure Gospel church* of your ancestors. If it is a pure church, we shall find the spirit of the Gospel exhibited in the lives and characters of its members. Here is Motley’s History, a standard and excellent work—not a church history; if it was, you might evasively accuse it of bias—but it is a *secular* history, called ‘The Rise of the Dutch Republic.’ In vol. i. p. 79, it is thus stated: ‘There is no doubt that the Anabaptist delusion *was so ridiculous and so loathsome* as to palliate, or at least to render intelligible the wrath with which they were regarded by all parties. The turbulence of the sect was alarming to constituted authorities: its *bestiality disgraceful* to the cause of religious reformation. *The leaders were among the most depraved of human creatures, as much distinguished for licentiousness, blasphemy, and cruelty, as their followers for grovelling superstition.* The evil spirit driven out of Luther, seemed, in orthodox eyes, to have taken possession of a herd of swine. The Germans, Munzer and Hoffman, had been succeeded as chief prophet by a Dutch broker named John Matthiessen, of Harlem; who announced himself as Enoch. Chief of this man’s disciples was the notorious John Bockholdt, of Leyden. Under the government of this prophet, the Anabaptists mastered the city of Munster. Here they confiscated property, plundered churches, violated females, murdered men——’”

“Hold!” exclaimed Squire Tanner. “Mr. Graves says that the Christian church must prove its identity with the church at Jerusalem, and to have been so acknowledged in the Apostolic period, *and to have been in existence in all subsequent ages, and free of the blood of the saints* (Great Iron Wheel, p. 28).

What absurdity to claim this herd of swine, as Motley says they were considered, as a Gospel church! Go on, Mr. Halley: I can expect anything, however monstrous, after this."

"Murdered men who refused to join their gang, and, in brief, practised *all the enormities which humanity alone can conceive or perpetrate*. The prophet proclaimed himself king of Zion, and sent out apostles to preach his doctrines in Germany and the Netherlands. Polygamy being a leading article of the system, he exemplified the principle by marrying *fourteen wives!* Of these the beautiful widow of Matthiessen was chief, and was called the Queen of Zion, and wore a golden crown. The prophet made many fruitless efforts to seize Amsterdam and Leyden. The armed invasion of the Anabaptists was repulsed, but their contagious madness spread. The plague broke forth in Amsterdam. On a cold winter's night (February, 1535) seven men and five women, inspired by the Holy Ghost (!?), threw off their clothes, and rushed naked and raving through the streets, shrieking, Woe, woe, woe! The wrath of God! the wrath of God! When arrested, they obstinately refused to put on their clothing. 'We are,' they observed, 'the naked truth!——'"

"I am sick—soul-sick!" interrupted Elder Clayton. "I am ashamed that I ever bore the name of Baptist!"

"The guilt lies not there," replied Halley; "but in claiming such infuriated demons, and low, debased mortals as the pure church of the meek and lowly Jesus. In that is guilt, and should be shame! But there is more and abundant testimony on this point. Ranke, another secular historian, gives a similar account of this fanatical sect. Mosheim, Hase, and D'Aubigne, confirm all these statements and add much more. Now, Elder Mason, do you still persist in the claim that, through them, you trace the pure church 'after the model set up by Christ himself?'"

"No, I persist in nothing of the kind! And if that evidence

be true which you have read, I have been most grossly deceived. I cannot make it seem possible, that Mr. Graves, or any other leader in our denomination, *would dare*, in the face of such historical testimony, to persist in such a claim for a moment; or, to use his own words: 'thus to abuse human reason and divine revelation, and address mankind as a race of idiots!' And it is still more astounding, if true, that he sometimes claims them, and sometimes rejects them, to suit the occasion!"

"To satisfy yourself that he does reject them, and that, too, in the most indignant terms, you have only to refer to the passages quoted, and to the works cited a few moments since on that point. And then again, on the other hand, that he does claim them, I refer you to Great Iron Wheel, p. 568, and to Theodosia Ernest, vol. i. p. 172, which I have just cited, and also vol. ii. p. 418: 'Luther had no great objections to the Baptists in his early efforts. He encouraged the *Munzer* of notoriety, who was a *Baptist minister!*' Now remember that this very *Munzer* was one of the *first leaders* of this infuriated gang. Says John Lord, the historian: 'Many pretended to special divine illumination — the great central principle of all fanaticism. Among these was Thomas *Munzer*, of Zwickau, mystical, ignorant, and conceited.' Says D'Aubigne, vol. iii. p. 56: 'And another of the initiated, by name Thomas *Munzer*, a man of fanatical turn of mind, gave to the new sect (Anabaptists) a regular organization.' Again, p. 208: 'Melanchthon wrote — We are here in imminent danger. If *Munzer* be successful, it is all over with us; unless Christ should appear for our deliverance. *Munzer's progress is marked by more than Scythian cruelty.* His threats are more dreadful than I can tell you.' Dr. Murdock, speaking of the Anabaptists, says: 'The most prominent of these fanatics were Thomas *Munzer* and one Pfeiffer.' So testify Mosheim, Hase, Ranke, and other historians. Who now will step into the breach and attempt to reconcile these counter-claims, and to harmonize these conflict-

ing statements of Brother Graves? What Baptist brother will now stand up and claim these fanatics as his ancestors to establish a '*regular succession*,' and then immediately thereafter denounce them as aliens, and take the safer and more tenable ground that he sprang from the *Independents* of Britain?

"Brother Mason retires from the field of controversy; shall we also suspend the investigation, or shall we continue to examine the claims of friend Graves? The positions taken, and points urged thus far by Elder Mason, are essentially those of Mr. Graves when engaged in a like undertaking—establishing an '*apostolic succession*.' Shall we then go on?" asked Halley.

"Yes! yes!" was the hearty and ready response from all parts of the room.

"Very well, then, we will proceed. The next claim that friend Graves urges, is, that those who were called Anabaptists, and in later times, Mennonites, were the original Waldenses. To prove this, he refers to a report from Dr. Ypeig, and Dr. J. J. Durmont, who were appointed by the king of Holland to examine into the origin and history of the *Dutch* Baptists. But before referring more particularly to that report, I wish to call your attention once again to the character of the community we have now reached; and will do it in the words of Kohlrausch, the great German historian, in his *History of Germany*, p. 272: 'Everywhere, as in all such scenes of fanaticism, the most licentious acts were committed, and passions, the most violent and brutal, raged throughout the city (Munster). Under the sanction of their creed of *Christian liberty*, each man was *authorized* to take to himself several wives.' Now (in *Great Iron Wheel*, p. 569), Graves says, that these men reported 'Anabaptists, and in later times (called) Mennonites, have descended from the tolerably pure evangelical Waldenses.' Mr. Graves makes a somewhat less qualified statement than that in *Theodosia Ernest* (vol. i. p. 173); and adds: 'The Baptists may be considered as the only Christian community which has stood

since the Apostles; and as a Christian society which has preserved pure the doctrines of the Gospel in all ages.’”

“I would call attention to that quotation from the report of Drs. Ypeig and Durmont,” said Anna. “They say the Mennonites were descended from the ‘*tolerably pure*’ evangelical Waldenses — what does that mean? *Tolerably pure!* Does it not imply that there was a community of Waldenses *more pure* from which they were *not* descended? I would like to know what the points of difference are between the ‘*tolerably pure*’ and the pure Waldenses. Can you tell us, Mr. Halley?”

“We shall find,” replied Halley, “that the ‘*tolerably pure*’ were that sect led off from them, by one Peter de Bruys, in the twelfth century, who taught that one must not only believe, but also work out his own salvation by good works, alms, deeds, etc. But infants were incapable of thus believing and working out their own salvation, and so must be lost; therefore they should not be baptized. The old Waldenses—pure Waldenses—believed that infants were saved through the blood of Christ, and therefore advocated and practised infant baptism. And I am now prepared to show, that, while the *Dutch* Baptists may have descended in an indirect line from the ‘*tolerably pure* evangelical Waldenses,’—Petrobrusians, who had their *origin* in Peter de Bruys in the twelfth century, we, on the other hand, are descended in a direct line from the pure evangelical Waldenses, who date back to the very time of the Apostles; for these Waldenses, in the time of the Reformation, readily united with and became *absorbed in* the reformed churches.

“But first let us examine the historical evidences regarding the origin, age, and faith of the Waldenses. Dr. Gilly, in his *Waldensian Researches*, has fully established the fact, that these are the primitive apostolic churches, having the genuine and unbroken succession from the time of the Apostles. This also Dr. Allix, in his *History of the Waldenses*, has confirmed. They say that the Waldenses are no followers of a reformer.

They are no dissenters from Romanism; but Rome went off from them. Says Dr. Gilly: 'These Alpine tribes embraced the Gospel as it was first announced to them in all its apostolic purity. And they continued true to it in the midst of almost general apostacy.' This is proved by the most satisfactory and reliable documents of the Waldenses themselves. Says the eminent and learned Swiss reformer — the colleague and successor of Calvin — Theodore Beza: 'As for the Waldenses, give me leave to call them the very seed of the primitive and pure church, being those who have been so upheld by the providence of God, that neither these numberless storms and tempests by which the whole Christian world have been shaken, nor those horrible persecutions which have been so directly raised against them, have been able to prevail upon them to yield a voluntary submission to the Roman tyranny and idolatry' (See Beza's *Icones*, Vir. Doct.).

"Sir James Mackintosh states: 'With the *dawn of history* we discover some simple Christians in the valleys of the Alps, where they still (about 1800) exist under the name of the Vaudois, who by the light of the New Testament, saw the extraordinary contrast between the purity of the primitive times and the vices of the gorgeous and imperial hierarchy which surrounded them.' Says Dr. Samuel Miller in an Introductory Letter to a late edition of Perrin's *History of the Old Waldenses*: 'Our anti-pedobaptist brethren also lay claim to the Waldenses as the advocates of their creed, both as to the subjects and the mode of baptism. The most cursory perusal of the ensuing volume will convince every impartial reader that there is no foundation whatever for this claim. But there is one notorious, unquestionable fact, which is sufficient, of itself, to refute the allegation, both of Prelatists and anti-pedobaptists, in regard to the Waldenses; and that is, that after the Reformation on the Continent of Europe, and the organization of the Reformed churches, on the Presbyterian plan, in France,

Switzerland, Germany, &c., the Waldenses acknowledged them as true churches; *held communion with them; received ministers from them*, and in every variety of way, manifested that they recognized their regular Christian character, and the validity of their ministry. This, surely, could never have been done, if the Waldenses had maintained the divine right of Prelacy, or the obligation of the anti-pedobaptist system.'

"Robert Baird, D. D., in his 'History of the Waldenses and Protestantism in Italy,' gives us a clear insight into their history, origin, and faith. He travelled extensively among them, and gathered his information not only from their own works and histories, but also from living witnesses and traditions handed down from time immemorial. He says on p. 288, 'Let it be observed, then, that the Waldenses maintain, and have done so from the date of their *earliest existing histories*, that their ancestors inhabited the country which they now inhabit, and *held the faith which they now hold since the days of the Apostles*. They are of the opinion that the Gospel was preached to their forefathers in those valleys by Christian missionaries from Rome, or other cities in Italy, where it had gained extensive ground; or that it was introduced by those who fled from the plain country, perhaps some of them from Rome itself, or the neighborhood thereof, *during the persecutions under the Roman emperors*.'

"Again, p. 290: 'We will only add at present, that in one of their manuscripts, dated 1587 (during the progress of the Reformation), and deposited in the library of the University of Cambridge, in England, the question is put, At what time have the religion and state been preached in the valleys? The answer is, about 500 years, as can be collected from many histories; but according to the belief of the inhabitants of the valleys, it has been from *time immemorial*; and from father to son *since the time of the Apostles*.' (See Moreland's History of the Evangelical Churches, etc. p. 29.) 'The replies,' continues

Dr. Baird, 'of various pastors to whom we ourselves have addressed similar questions, have invariably been to the same effect.'

"And Dr. Baird says again, p. 331: 'We have said enough in relation to the antiquity of the Waldenses, to establish to a reasonable degree, the position that Christianity was early planted in the valley which they now occupy, lying between the north part of Italy and the south of France, in which countries we have indubitable proof that the truth was long maintained after it had been abandoned in almost all the rest part of Christendom. Nothing can be more probable than that they adhered to the pure Gospel, which they had either heard from the Apostles themselves, or from very early Christian missionaries. This supposition is abundantly sustained by the testimony of both the friends and the enemies of the people.' In Sir James Moreland's History of the Churches of Piedmont, p. 228, is given their petition to their prince, the Duke of Savoy, in 1559: 'This religion which we profess is not only ours, nor has it been invented of late years, as has been most falsely reported. It is the religion of our fathers, of our grandfathers, and yet other more ancient predecessors of ours, and of the blessed martyrs, confessors, prophets, and Apostles. And if any can prove to the contrary, we are ready to subscribe and yield thereto.'

"*Claudius Seissel*, the Roman Archbishop of Turin, testified in the year 1500: 'That the Vaudois sect originated with one Lyon, a devout man of the days of Constantine the Great' (in the early part of the fourth century).

"*Cassini*, an Italian priest, testified that he had found it handed down by tradition, that the Vaudois were as ancient as the Christian church.

"*Simon de Montfort*, an unrelenting persecutor of the Waldenses, says, in his book entitled 'The Exploits of Montfort,' which was written in the year 1218: 'The city of Thoulouse has *never* been clear of this detestable pestilence of the Wal-

denses.' *Eckbert*, a Roman author who flourished A. D. 1160, says: 'These secluded men have *many ages*, in their lurking places, corrupted the Christian faith of simple men.' A manuscript is mentioned by Dr. Gilly, dated A. D. 1100, which having quoted the doctrines of the Waldenses, adds: 'They have maintained these doctrines from time immemorial, in continual descent from father to son, even from the times of the Apostles.'

"*Claude*, a learned and pious Spaniard, and Bishop of Turin, within whose diocese the Waldenses nominally were, was in the habit of calling them (A. D. 840), 'That new sect.' (See Gilly, p. 6.) Also in the year 840, *Jonas*, Bishop of Orleans, in a work on 'Images,' dedicated to King Charles the Bald, makes mention of the Italian churches, and accuses them of heterodoxy because they refused to worship images, and because of their separation from what he called the Catholic Unity. It is evident he alluded to the Waldenses, for he raves at the celebrated *Claude*, Bishop of Turin, in whose diocese they were, on account of his encouraging them in the rejection of images. (See the *Bibl. Patr.* tome iv. 533 and 594.) So also (see same work, tome xiii. p. 299) *Reinerius* (A. D. 1250), an apostate Waldensian, whose zeal and cruelty afterward raised him to the post of Inquisitor, has left this record of his former friends. He says: 'They are the most pernicious of all sects, for these three reasons. I. Because they are *the most ancient*, being more ancient than the Manichæians and Arians of the fourth century. They, according to some, derive their descent from Pope Sylvester, who lived in 335; according to others, from the time of the Apostles. II. Because they were spread over all countries, and existed in immense numbers, particularly in the north of Italy and the south of France. III. Because they have the character of being pious and virtuous, because they believe in all the articles of the Apostles' creed, and are guilty of no other crime than that of blasphemy against the Roman church and clergy.'

“*Abbot St. Bernard* says: ‘There is a sect which calls itself after no man’s name, which affects to be in the direct line of apostolical succession; and rustic and unlearned though it is, it contends that we (Romanists) are in the wrong, and that it alone is in the right.’ This was written in 1140. Here, then, is evidence of an immense population opposed to Rome, and holding the same doctrines with Protestants, who yet acknowledge no leader—no founder whose memory they held in honor, and to whose particular tenets they subscribed, as did all other sects, such as Arians, Paulicans, Petrobrusians, etc.

“This reminds me, too, that this extraordinary statement of the Romanist *St. Bernard*, was made about the time that *Peter de Bruys* led off a small fraction of the Waldenses, and established the first society that can be found on the pages of history particularly allied to the Baptist faith of the present day. The Petrobrusians were the *very first sect* of which we have any knowledge which used *baptism at all*, and at the same time denied it to infants. This fact no one, conversant with the history of the church, can deny. Says *Dr. Woods* (see *Infant Baptism*, p. 132): ‘I shall only add the remark of *Dr. Wall*, that *the first body of men we read of that denied baptism to infants, were the Petrobrusians, A. D. 1150.*’”

“What evidence have you that the Waldenses believed in and practised infant baptism?” asked *Anna*.

“The evidence,” replied *Halley*, “is abundant and reliable from both the friends and enemies of this simple people. *John Eckius*, the great opponent of *Luther*, reproached him that he had only renewed the heresies of the Waldenses and Albigenses, of *Wickliff*, and of *John Huss*, which had been long ago condemned.

“*Bellarmino* asserts that the identical belief which was publicly taught and professed in the valleys of Piedmont, in the year 820 and onwards, was the very same which is at this day professed and owned by the Reformed churches (*Leger*, part i.

p. 174). *Genebrard*, a Benedictine monk, born in 1537, in a third book of his *Chronicles*, calls the doctrine of *Claude* and his followers, in rejecting the traditions of Rome, *Calvinists'* doctrine; and denominates the Waldenses *Calvinists*.

“Says Dr. Samuel Miller: ‘Wm. Jones, an eminent Baptist, in his “History of the Waldenses,” has so mutilated and perverted the plainest documents of those pious witnesses of the truth, in order to make them speak the language of anti-pedobaptists, as to place his character as an honest historian in a most undesirable position.’ Still there is evidence to be found in his work which goes to prove their creed the same as that of the Reformed and Calvinistic churches (see vol. ii. p. 87): ‘*Lindanus*, a Roman Catholic bishop of the see of Ghent, who wrote in defence of the tenets of the church of Rome, about the year 1560, represents John Calvin as the inheritor of the doctrine of the Waldenses. *Mezeray*, the learned historiographer of France, in his *Abridgment of Chronology*, speaking of the Waldenses, says: “They held nearly the same opinions as those who are now called *Calvinists*.” *Gualter*, a Jesuitical monk, in his chronological tables, drew up a catalogue consisting of twenty-seven particulars, in which he shows that the principles of the Waldenses, and those of the *Calvinists*, coincided with each other.’ Let us now produce direct testimony. In the University of Geneva there is a Waldensian manuscript, bearing the date of 1100, which contains a complete outline of their faith. Dr. Gilly took a fac-simile copy of it, and it is to be found in his *Waldensian Researches*, p. 139. It is also found in Perrin’s *History of Waldenses*. By it, as from other sources, we learn that their faith was pure and orthodox. They held only to two sacraments—The Lord’s Supper, in which they used both bread and wine, and of which each Christian received, and Baptism, by pure water only; and repelled it as a grievous slander which Papists brought against them, that they refused baptism to their infants. See also Milner’s *Eecl*.

History, and Sir Samuel Moreland's History of Waldenses, and an Exhibition of their Creeds and Confessions; also, Dr. Allix's History of them.

"Here in Perrin's History of the Waldenses, their articles of faith are given (lib. ii. c. 4. p. 81). They are seventeen in number. I will read the last: 'As to sacraments, it hath been determined by the Holy Scriptures that we have but two sacramental signs or symbols which Christ Jesus hath left unto us: the one is Baptism, the other the Eucharist or Lord's Supper, which we receive to demonstrate our perseverance in the faith, according to the promise we made in *our baptism in our infancy*, as also in remembrance of that great benefit which Jesus Christ hath conferred upon us, when he laid down his life for our redemption, cleansing us with his most precious blood.' This is also found in Dr. Baird's work, p. 396.

"Did the Waldenses practise *immersion* in baptism?" asked Elder Clayton.

"They did not," replied Halley. "This might be inferred from the authorities already cited, showing that their faith and forms of worship were like those of the Reformed churches—were *Calvinistic*. Says Dr. Baird, p. 382: 'When the rite of baptism is to be administered, it immediately follows the sermon. The minister, after a special prayer for the occasion, and an address to the parents, or those who present the child, descends from the pulpit, places his hands together, into which some one present pours water from a vial or small bottle, which he in turn pours upon the child, pronouncing at the same time its name, and repeating the words of the institution: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." The whole form, phrasology, etc., is exactly like what exists in our Presbyterian and Congregational churches.'

"Dr. Miller gives us a large number of quotations from their own Confessions of faith, and other writings drawn up between the twelfth century and the period of the Reformation; I will

read a few of them. 'Baptism,' say they, 'is administered in a full congregation of the faithful (not in a river or pond) to the end that he that is received into the church may be reputed and held of all as a Christian brother, and that all the congregation may pray for him, that he may be a Christian in heart, as he is outwardly esteemed to be a Christian. *And for this cause it is that we present our children in baptism*, which ought to be done by those to whom the children are most nearly related, such as their parents, or those to whom God has given this charity' (Apology of the Waldenses sent to King Lancelaus). Again, referring to the superstitious additions to baptism which the Papists had introduced, they say, in an ancient MS., dated 1220 (the "Book of Antechrist"), of the Chrism — sign of the cross — extreme unction, etc. 'But we find nothing in the Scriptures touching such orders as they pretend, but only the custom of the church. There is no ground to show that Christ, or his Apostles, did institute any such thing.'

"In another MS., of about the same date, occurs this passage under the head of Dancing: 'Again, they that dance, break that promise and agreement which they have made with God in baptism, when their god-fathers promised for them that they shall renounce the devil and all his works' (See Perrin, p. 241). And in a reply to a slander from their Popish neighbors, they say: 'Yet, notwithstanding, *we bring our children to be baptized.*'

"I will now read a little from Murdock's Mosheim (vol. iii. pp. 200, 201): 'It is a well-known historic fact, that in the 16th century, the *genuine* descendants of the old Waldensians, Wickliffites, and Hussites, who were numerous in France, England, Bohemia, Moravia, &c., readily united with the Lutheran and the Reformed communities, and at length *became absorbed in them*, and that very few, if any of them, ever manifested a preference for the Mennonites, or for any of the anti-pedobaptist sects of that age. The first Mennonites were not persons

who had before borne the name of Waldnsians, or who were known descendants of Waldensians; nor did they originate either *in* or *near* the countries where the Waldensians in that age resided. And if we attempt to trace the history of that grand peculiarity of all Mennonites, their confining baptism to adult believers, and rejecting infant baptisms altogether, we shall find, that at the time Menno first embraced it, it existed among the numerous German Anabaptists, but not among the Waldenses of France, or Bohemia, who were then universally believers in infant baptism, and were in fraternal communion with the Lutheran and Reformed churches. These Waldensian Pedobaptists, moreover, declared that they held the same belief which their fathers had maintained for several centuries, and they appealed to their old books to make good their assertions. There were indeed various mystical sects, tintured more or less with Manichæan views, in the 12th and following centuries, who rejected all water baptism, on much the same grounds as the Quakers still do, and some of these assailed infant baptism especially, as being peculiarly unsuitable and absurd. There is also pretty good evidence that early in the 12th century, *Peter de Bruys*, and his successor *Henry*, with their followers, the Petrobrusians and Henricans, did at first reject infant baptism without discarding all baptism. But soon after Peter Waldo arose, and we hear no more of the Petrobrusians and Henricans. They probably gave up their opposition to infant baptism.'

“Drs. Baird, Faber, and Blair, further assure us of the great antiquity of these simple people—handing down their faith in its purity and simplicity, even from the days of the Apostles—and, moreover, add that they were Pedobaptists, and held to, and practised, infant baptism. More evidence might be adduced, but certainly no more could be desired. It has been made doubly certain. The testimony of the Waldenses themselves at the present time, and all along back, up through

many generations, even before the 12th century, declare infant baptism to have been their practice from the very times of the Apostles; also we have cited to you the testimony of their bitterest enemies in all ages, which in harmony with their own statements assures us of their great antiquity, and the uniformity of their faith. Do you think anything more is needed to make assurance doubly sure?"

"No, certainly not!" exclaimed Squire Tanner; "that point was made out long ago. Nothing more was necessary. And now having added their own testimony to what was already evident, every doubt disappears, and every possibility of conjecture. They unquestionably knew what they believed and what the faith of their ancestors was, and that, too, better than their neighbors or their enemies—they must be acknowledged competent witnesses in the case."

"Now call to mind," continued Halley, "that we proved yesterday that all the churches of the primitive *Christians*, down through *four centuries*, were Pedobaptist churches; and that the writers in them, the church fathers, declare that infant baptism was not only universally practised, but also that it was ordered of the Apostles. And then recollect that we to-day began at the last link in the chain—the Reformed Pedobaptist churches of this age—and have gone backward with a connection of incontrovertible historic evidence, showing that the only pure Gospel church which has kept an unbroken descent from the Apostles, is now, and always has been, a Pedobaptist church. Who then, if any, need or can boast of their ancestry? Does it appear now that infant baptism is a corruption of the Romish church? Friend Graves says: 'We may well be proud to be able to claim these (Waldenses) as our brethren.' He would be proud, if he *were able*, but alas! for him and his statements, *all history is against him*. It will require another volume from Brother Graves to clear up the labyrinthine mysteries in which he seems to have involved himself."

“There are some other sects,” said Anna, “which Mr. Graves mentions in his works, that I would like to inquire after.”

“Will you give us their names, Miss Anna?”

“They are the Albigenses, Paulicans, Cathari or Puritans, Novationists, and Donatists.”

“First, then, the Albigenses,” continued Halley, “that was a *general* name given to all French heretics, and included a number of widely differing sects, and among the rest the Waldenses. Graves says (The. E. ii. p. 464): that ‘These 800,000 Albigenses were Baptists!’ This is a very modest claim, and sounds very much as it would for any one to assert that all in the Reformed Pedobaptist churches are Quakers!

“Peter Sarnensis, a writer of that age (1209), divides the Albigenses into various sects; and says (c. ii. p. 8) that the Waldenses were the best among them. Those sects called Cathari, Publicani or Paulicians, and Bulgari, were also included. These were called Albigenses in a limited sense. Hence, it comprehended three distinct sects by name, yet all three very nearly alike in their faith and doctrines.

“The Paulicians in France were called the Albigenses; in Italy, the Cathari and Paterini; and by the Greeks, Manichæans (See Mosheim, vol. ii. pp. 103, and 201). Let us examine their creed, which is the same or similar to that professed by all those sects which are denominated Gnostics. Their doctrines were (Mosheim, vol. ii. p. 104): I. ‘They denied that this lower and visible world was created by the Supreme God, etc. II. They contemned the Virgin Mary, etc. III. They did not celebrate the Lord’s Supper. IV. They loaded the Cross with contumely. V. They rejected the books composing the Old Testament. VI. They excluded presbyters or elders from the administration of the church.’”

“There is no Baptist doctrine there, as I can perceive,” said Elder Clayton.

“No,” replied Halley; “if they had the ‘*grand distinguishing*

peculiarities' of our Baptist brethren, Mosheim overlooks it in the above paragraph. Yet, lest some Baptist, like Brother Graves, whose zeal runs away with his modesty; or perhaps I should say, whose sectarian spirit blunts his moral sensibilities, so that he cannot readily distinguish between truth and error—lest this should occur, I will cite to you Dr. Hase, who ascribes the same tenets and origin to the Cathari and Paulicans (or Paulicians), and adds they *did not use baptism at all*. And the same is implied by what Mosheim says in another paragraph, *that they rejected ALL EXTERNAL FORMS.*' These were the model and ancestral Baptists claimed by Brother Graves."

A half-suppressed laugh passed round the room, accompanied by exclamations: "Is it possible! Model Baptists, indeed! Why, they were Quakers!" etc.

"Brother Graves adds a link or rather a name more in '*Theodosia*' (vol. ii. p. 465)," continued Halley. "He says, 'the *Paternines* denounced infant baptism, and baptized by immersion, as indeed all parties did at that time. They were called *Paternines* from the patience with which they suffered for the cause of Christ. He refers to Robinson's *History of Baptists*, pp. 428-430. Unfortunately for Mr. Graves' statement, I have the work here; and he on those pages is speaking of some individuals in 1690, whereas Mr. Graves is speaking of the year 750; and moreover, there is *not a word* said there about the *Paternines*; and what is still more strange, in glancing over the work, I have *not seen the name mentioned at all!* I have found it neither in the table of contents, nor in the body of the work!"

"Is not that work considered good authority?" asked Anna.

"I will answer your question by referring you to Dr. Woods on *Infant Baptism* (2d ed., p. 140); from which I will quote a few sentences. 'In reference to one of the writers to whom I have alluded, namely, R. Robinson, whose *History of Baptism* is often referred to as good authority by the Baptists of Ame-

rica, being unwilling to trust my own judgment merely, I have requested my respected colleague, the Rev. Moses Stuart, to favor me with his views. In compliance with my request he has sent me the following letter, with liberty to insert it in a note.' I will quote a few passages from the letter. 'Having so often heard the book spoken highly of, and knowing something of Mr. Robinson's talents and character, I had a great curiosity to see it. I have examined it on various topics, and confess myself to be greatly disappointed, and not a little disgusted. There is everywhere in it, an air of almost *profane levity*; which at times breaks forth into the most gross and *palpable indecency*. * * How is it possible, that serious and sensible men of the Baptist community could have ever recommended such a book as this to the public? Withal, there is such a gross and palpable unfairness in Robinson's examination of the testimony of the Christian Fathers, and such a shallow criticism both on them and on the New Testament, that one may well wonder, that this book should meet with encouragement among men of sobriety and good sense. There is, indeed, an appearance of a kind of learning in the author; but it is merely that of a literary *gourmand*, who has read everything curious and entertaining, and but very little that is solid, *and has reasoned and reflected still less on what he has read.*'

"This answers your question, Miss Anna, and we will now return to the Paternines, and see what they really were. Moheim (vol. ii. p. 166, and n. 23) says, 'They were the Manichæans, and Paternines, and *was ONE of the names* by which the Paulicians or Manichæans were designated in Italy, who are well known to have migrated from Bulgaria to Italy in this age, and who were the same as were also called Cathari.'"

"We have already learned, then, what their doctrines were," said Tanner. "These seem to have been different names for essentially the same sect; and we have been assured by unquestionable testimony, that they not only rejected *all baptism*,

but also, *all external forms whatever!* I do not desire to claim them, nor even to acknowledge them, among my church ancestors, however strenuously Mr. Graves may labor to that end."

"You see, then," said Halley, "how hard Mr. Graves was pushed for names and connections in his 'regular apostolic succession.' Here are no less than *four* of his names, or sects — Albigenes, Paulicans, Cathari or Puritans, and the Paternines — all meaning the same thing, and designating a sect or community, which *rejected all baptism, all external forms, and the Old Testament Scriptures*, and doubted the ability of God to create this mundane sphere. What beautiful immersionists they must have been! What *pure* doctrines, forms, and discipline they adhered to, and practised! What a pure church they were!

"The difficulty was, Mr. Graves had predetermined himself of apostolical ancestry; and no matter what the facts in the case *were*, they must all *bend and be so colored* as to put on the *appearance* of producing the required testimony! On p. 467, he jumps back from the last-mentioned sects to the year 300, and asserts that then they were *all* Baptist churches except a few in Africa; and thus he completes his ancestry, and submits his claims of heirship!

"But we have already shown that during the first *four centuries* there was not a Baptist church in existence! And we are now ready to show that there was not one in existence during the *eleven centuries* succeeding the ascension of our Savior! The Novatians and Donatists were disposed of yesterday, and there is only one more community mentioned by Mr. Graves (p. 470, vol. ii.), as he says, '*To complete our chain!*' This is added, I have no doubt, for effect, and to give the already extended list of names a more respectable appearance. But how it would link in, or terminate the chain of succession with those *who did not use baptism at all*, even if granted to be a Baptist community, I respectfully submit to your judgment."

“What is the name of that sect or society?” asked Anna. “I cannot recall any other sect.”

“Mr. Graves, being a very modest man, does not designate it by any *particular* name,” replied Halley. “He only says that on examination he has found them to be Baptist churches!”

“Do you admit them to have been Baptist churches?” asked Squire Tanner.

“By no means! and I think you will agree with me, in view of what has already been adduced, when you learn to whom he makes reference. I will read the passage: ‘John (the Baptist) at that time had prepared, or was preparing, a people made ready for the Lord. After Jesus had been baptized by him, he, by his disciples, continued to baptize. Out of these a church was formed, as the model for others. The Apostles formed many like it in various places. We have already examined them, and found that they were Baptist churches.’”

The audience present were not able to restrain themselves in view of this very modest assumption of Mr. Graves, and a general outburst of laughter was the result.

“I think,” continued Halley, “that we have already determined that question from the word of God—we disposed of it from Scripture evidence alone. In the light of the teachings of the Bible we decided that Mr. Graves has no claims there; and this decision has been affirmed and strengthened by every step we have taken in examining the history of the church. This decision, in view of all the proofs, assumes the highest possible degree of moral certainty. The convincing and corroborative testimony, and the positive and circumstantial evidence in favor of it, place it beyond the question of a doubt in the mind of every candid and unprejudiced person. Let us for a moment take a retrospect, and recall the principal points proved. We have shown that in the very establishment of the church God made an *everlasting* covenant with his professing people, and included their children; and also, that they have

been invariably included in his covenants with them in all subsequent times.—That the church, from the time of Abraham, has ever been the same in substance.—Infants were once members. They must be still, unless *some positive enactment* excluding them can be found. Not a shadow or vestige of one has ever been found in all the Bible—the covenant has never been abrogated—no revoking or repealing clause has ever been discovered—nor does tradition furnish anything of the kind.—Baptism has come in the place of circumcision as the seal of God's everlasting covenant, and the symbol of the purifying influences of the Holy Spirit upon the heart.—The privileges and sign of infant church-membership, to which all the first Christians had been so long accustomed, *could not have been abruptly withdrawn*, without greatly wounding the hearts of parents, and producing in them feelings of revolt and bitter complaint against the innovations of the new dispensation of the church.—The evidence is abundant of the frequent adoption of the *principle of family baptisms* in the time of the Apostles.—The New Testament abounds in passages which cannot reasonably be explained but in harmony with the doctrine of infant baptism.—The close and endearing connection between parents and children affords a strong argument in favor of the church-membership of the infant offspring of the professing believer.—The history of the Christian church from the apostolic age, furnishes an argument of irresistible force in favor of the Divine authority of infant baptism.—This ordinance was universally practised in the primitive church, and *without exception*, where baptism was used at all, for *eleven centuries* after the resurrection of our Savior.—The very first sect or community which baptized *only adults*, were the Petrobrusians, in the twelfth century; and they not only rejected the doctrine of infant baptism, but also of infant salvation. (See Dr. Kurtz's J. B.)

“In proving these points, we have not been obliged to *torture* the sacred Scriptures, or to misconstrue and manufacture histo-

rical facts. We have tested our faith by the pure word of God, and are willing to stand or fall by the truth. In setting forth our doctrines and belief, we have taken the sacred Scriptures in all their fullness, and have preserved them in all their simplicity. We have not forced the Bible to make such improbable and inconsistent statements, and to furnish such contradictory evidence, as becomes necessary on the part of our Baptist brethren in order to sustain their unnatural and isolated positions. We do not, for instance, render the labors of John the Baptist superhuman and miraculous. We do not make necessarily such the labors of a few disciples, by obliging them to immerse wholly, 5 or 8000 persons, on two different days, in the midst of a large and populous city scantily supplied with water, and with no conveniences for such an occasion; and the whole city, moreover, bitterly hostile to any such movement. We do not take a position where it would be necessary to make the *exceedingly improbable* supposition that eight or eleven families, taken at random, contained no children whatever! We avoid all this, and a thousand other improbabilities and inconsistencies, by taking the broad platform of the Pedobaptist faith.

“Why should Christians lay so much stress on mere external forms? It is the *heart* which God looks at. He seeks for spiritual worshippers only. If the heart is right in the sight of God, the service will be wholly acceptable. It is well, perhaps, that different *forms* of worship exist, as thereby religious influences may be brought to bear more directly upon the various phases of mind. But the spirit of Christian love and unity should be paramount to all sectarian zeal and party spirit, and second only to our love to God. Every pulsation, every heart-throb, should go out in Christian love to *all* the brethren and sisters in Christ. We do not expect entire *uniformity* in the Christian church; but we do expect, and shall have, entire *unanimity*. The Lord has said; and will he not accomplish? He has promised; and will he not fulfill? *The divisions of*

Zion shall be healed. The time will come when non-essentials—mere forms and ceremonies—shall retire to their own proper place in the background, and when the whole church—all of Christ's spiritual followers—shall come up on the broad catholic platform of Christian unanimity, and put forth their united efforts and prayers for the salvation of perishing souls around them, and for the conversion of the world. The prayer of our blessed Savior shall be answered. His new commandment, put forth to his people, shall be regarded: 'This is my commandment, that ye love one another, as I have loved you. Neither pray I for these alone; but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they *may be one*; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also *MAY BE ONE IN US*; that the *world may believe* that thou hast sent me.'

“Christian parents,—the charge intrusted to you is one, the most momentous and interesting that can be imagined by the human mind. It is the charge of immortal souls. Every child, when born into the world, enters upon an existence that is never to terminate, upon a short and precarious life on earth, which must be succeeded by eternal blessedness, or eternal woe. How solemn the consideration! And with regard to your own children, to you is committed the sacred trust, of imparting to them that knowledge, which, through the blessing of God, shall make them “wise unto salvation.” These lights, lighted with eternity, it is yours to feed with holy oil from the sanctuary of God, that they may burn, with pure and lovely radiance, before the throne above. These never-dying plants, it is yours to rear and to cherish, bringing down upon them, by your prayers, the dews and rains of heaven, that so they may flourish and bear fruit for ever, in the paradise of God. O forget not the sacred obligation. Let it be engraven on your hearts, “as with a pen of iron and the point of a diamond.” You love your children. They are as dear to you as the apple of your eye,—precious as your own souls. What is there that

you would not part with, to secure their well-being? And are not their eternal interests first in your thoughts, and first in your desires for them? If you feel as Christians, they are, — they must be. Let them, then, be first in your prayers, and first in your exertions. Seek to impress early on their hearts a sense of the unspeakable importance of eternal things. Teach them the knowledge and fear of the Lord, when you sit in the house, and when you walk by the way; never with the repulsive austerity of a master, but with all the engaging tenderness of paternal love. Let no prospect of temporal advantage induce you to expose their souls to any unnecessary hazards from the snares and temptations of a deceitful world. Let no corporeal attractions, and no mental accomplishments, however gratifying they may lawfully be, appropriate that peculiar joy, which, in the hearts of godly parents, must ever be reserved for “seeing their children walking in truth.” Set your hearts, with intense and unquenchable desire, on the salvation of your offspring. Ask it of God with fervor and importunity of faith. Show the sincerity of your prayers, by unwearied attention to the use of necessary means; and I doubt not, you will have the blessedness of seeing, amongst your offspring, a seed arise to serve the Lord. May the “God of the families of Israel” impress, more deeply than ever, upon your minds, the duty enjoined upon you! Let the baptism of your children — if they have been thus consecrated to God — and every baptism you are called to witness, remind you of your obligations, and bring you to your knees, with tears of conscious short-coming, and of earnest entreaty for grace to fulfill them.’ The controversy, my friends, is now closed. I think we have fully established our faith and doctrines. We have, from the word of God, shown them to be correct; and that all our positions taken, were grounded on the Bible; and further, confirmed and strengthened by the history of the church. May God add his blessing, and lead your minds in the way of all truth.”

CHAPTER XIII

“Let love, in one delightful stream
Through ev’ry bosom flow,
Let union sweet, and dear esteem,
In ev’ry action, glow.
Love is the golden chain that binds
The happy souls above;
And he’s an heir of heaven who finds
His bosom glow with love.”

“Like to the falling of a star,
Or as the flights of eagles are,
Or like the fresh spring’s gaudy hue,
Or silver drops of morning dew,
Or like a wind that chafes the flood,
Or bubbles which on water stood,—
Even such is man, whose borrow’d light
Is straight call’d in, and paid to-night.
The wind blows out; the bubble dies;
The spring entomb’d in autumn lies;
The dew dries up; the star is shot;
The flight is past; and man forgot.”

AFTER the controversy of the day was over, the excited crowd seemed loth to depart to their individual homes; they gathered in groups around the yards and gardens which encircled the Clayton house, and with earnest gestures and hurried tones of voice, gave expression to their convictions of truth and sense of duty.

“Well,” said one, “do’nt I step like one of your royal line? I feel as though our line of ancestry had been well defined, and

that our claims of legitimacy must for ever be established. Let me see—it goes thus: ‘Baptists alone have existed as pure communities of Christians from Christ’s ascension until now. It makes me feel as though I had pure blood in my veins!’”

A quiet laugh was the only rejoinder.

“I have heard this discussion from beginning to end,” said another, “and I am satisfied where the truth lies. All bitterness and strife among Christians, and these divisions of God’s family on minor questions, are from the author of all evil. And through these divisions and strifes he most effectually cripples the progress of the Christian world. Henceforth and for ever, I am neither of Paul, nor of Apollos, nor of Cephas, but of Christ. And whosoever bears the image of Christ, I will regard as Christ’s also, and recognize him as a brother in the Lord.”

“What! give up all denominational distinctions, and regard the members of other churches in the same light you do your own?” exclaimed a listener to the former remark, with surprise. “I have heard our ministers declare, that they had no doubt these distinctions were for the good of the *cause*, and that a man was a better Christian for having a good share of sectarian zeal. I never half believed it, though—that’s a fact!” he continued, aside to himself.

The man addressed raised his clear thoughtful eyes upon the eager circle around him, and replied: “Nevertheless, there are no sects or clans sanctioned in the word of God; and I take it God knows best what is for the good of his own cause. Saith the word: ‘Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment’ (1 Cor. i. 10). If ministers of the Gospel of Jesus Christ could realize the fearful responsibility they incur—yea, I may add guilt—in their anxiety to keep up dividing lines in God’s family, I verily believe they would shrink with terror from such

efforts, and retire with trembling anxious souls to their closets, and would come not forth to their charge and people again till they had more of the *spirit* of the Gospel in their hearts. I would like to read some of God's truth to these clerical strife venders and party agitators; and then bid them go with it to their places of secret prayer, and there examine themselves by it, as they may expect to be scrutinized by the light of eternity at the judgment-bar of God:—'tis better, by far, to be straitened now than then.

“Why is it so difficult,” he continued, “to regard all Christians as one brotherhood, though not precisely of the same name or mould? We do not reason so foolishly on any other subject. For example: here are a number of us in this circle who are farmers; we are called farmers because we cultivate the soil, yet no two of us agree as to the precise manner of its cultivation. Should that, then, be a cause of strife? Should we separate into clans, and wage exterminating warfare against everything that does not correspond with our manner of preparing the ground and sowing the seed? Let us try the experiment—and how soon would an outraged community drag us to an insane asylum! They would tell us: ‘*poor foolish mortals*, do’nt you know that *your way* has not arrived at a full state of perfection so that it cannot be improved upon? and besides there is an endless variety of soils, each requiring a different process of cultivation to develop its capacities of production,—what is good for one is not good for another, though the same seed be planted in both.’

“Now suppose one of us should still persist: ‘*I know I’m right! I tell you, I alone of all the world am a farmer!*’ and should further continue to reply to all the arguments brought against us, that farming means to cultivate the soil, and others cultivate the soil as well as we, and are equally entitled to be designated and recognized as farmers: ‘I tell you, *no!* I alone of all the world am a farmer, because I cultivate the soil. and

you see nobody else cultivates it just as I do.' You say at once such a man is mad, yet this is just the way some Christians reason about religion, and the world looks on in silence — no, not in silence. Skeptics listen and question with contempt; scoffers repeat exultingly their scoffing, and devils leer with savage satisfaction, and whisper new words to fan the blazing strife. Look at it, brethren, and see if it is not so. Here are Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians. We have studied each other's characters. We know each other to be Christians, and we talk about meeting in heaven as members of Christ's family, to become one in our Glorious Head; and now tell me, brethren, in the name of that God whom we all profess to love, why we cannot worship together here?" There was no reply. The usual reasoning urged—or rather evasion, "You do'nt think as I do," was rebuked; and each one was impressed with the thought that God has stamped an infinite variety on all the works of his hand—on mind as well as on matter. And although no spear of grass is an exact copy of another, and no leaf of the forests in the wide world has its exact counterpart, and no two Christian minds can have precisely the same view of God and of God's truth, yet grass is grass however various, leaves are leaves however different in form and appearance, and a child of God is a child of God, by whatever name called, and however much he may vary from his Christian brother in regard to mere forms and non-essentials.

The requirement made is: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." This is the only prerequisite essential to salvation. How simple its terms! Here is a landmark planted by Jehovah himself, and around it *all Christians* gather—*here they must meet*. "BELIEVE," thou trembling soul, and remember Paul testifies: "After that ye believe, ye are sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise." Thou art, then, a child of the Most High God—an heir of glory sealed with the signet of heaven! Rejoice then, even in view of that

diversity of mind which enables one brother to gain access to truths denied to another, and that other still to overreach his fellow in pursuits of knowledge and wisdom where the former fails or comes short of a full and clear understanding of the difficult questions before him—for it is of God. One soul is precious in his sight, for its simple clinging trust which asks not why?—and could not comprehend if it should ask. Another is not loved the less or more, because it reaches with a bold hand and grasps truths beyond the sphere of the ordinary mind, and looks far into the mysteries of God's moral government, and longs for clearer insights, and more distant views! God only requires his children to worship him according to the diversity of gifts bestowed upon them. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all *thy* soul, might, mind, and strength." Not with the strength and mind of thy neighbor, but of *thyself*. Such thoughts as these crowded the interval of silence following the question put by the last speaker. And as he, during this impressive silence, turned and gazed upon the bowed form, and the tearful eyes of one whose head was whitened by the frosts of many winters, he asked :

"What say you, Father Benjamin?"

"Brethren," replied the old man, with a voice tremulous with emotion, "you all know my sands of life are nearly run out—one foot is already in the grave—and standing thus with a loosened grasp on earth, I look back on this world boiling and seething with human passions; and, then, I remember how our blessed Savior loved this sin-benighted world; and, then, I call to mind that God hath said in his word: 'Whereas there is among you envying, strife, and divisions; are ye not carnal and walk as men?' And again: 'To be carnally-minded is death; because the carnal mind is enmity against God, and is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. O, my brethren, this has long been to me a subject of thought and of prayer. I have cried out in my agony of soul: When will

Christians exhibit in their lives the spirit of the Gospel of Christ? God hasten the time! O how I have longed for the millennial sun to begin to brighten the East! I am old now—I never shall see it! But blessed be God, that he hath granted to me, even in the twilight of the evening of my days, to lift up my eyes and behold the fig-tree, and all the trees, how they shoot forth—and I know the summer is now nigh at hand! Christian souls are flowing together. UNION is becoming the watchword of the times! God's Spirit follows this flowing together in holiness and love of Christian souls, and comes down in answer to their united cry, so that the Protestant world is to-day one great revival scene! Praise God! This is the morning star, and these are the enkindling rays which bode the coming day!"

In another corner of the yard was a small group who resolved that "sink or swim" they would stick to the old platform of "one churchism," and, if need be, they would remove their church connections immediately to some body not infected with such heresies, fearing lest they too might become contaminated. We with no little curiosity scrutinize their faces, and count them—thank God, there are only five! As we look further, it is plainly to be seen that the leaven of God's truth is working deeply among the masses; you can trace it in the thoughtful glance and in the determined air. The masses are truly thinking—and well we know *there is hope of all who think.*

There were clustered on the neatly-scoured floor of the Clayton kitchen a group of women, also discussing earnestly the great topic of the day; but Mother Clayton is too busy in her preparations for tea to give them any attention. The more eagerly questions are proposed and the warmer the discussion becomes, the more industriously she labors, and energetically she moves, with a splash here and a bang there, as though she would impress the idea more forcibly than did Gallio of old, that she "cared for none of those things." Ever since Elder

Burton's departure she had eschewed doctrinal controversies. She "vowed a vow" never more to meddle with theological questions—which course we heartily recommend to all under similar circumstances, and hope they may be equally successful in keeping it.

But this group of women are evidently of another mind. Nearly all of them have near and dear relatives who are members of other branches of the great Evangelical church, and who give equal evidence, with Baptist Christians, of piety and acceptance with God.

To be required to denounce these as outsiders, and even as "Antichrist," touched their feelings. They do not stop to reason (most women do not—and why should they, when their higher natural impulses are as true to the right as the needle to the pole?)—they *feel* it is wrong; and with feelings bursting forth in this channel, they are about to wield an influence as irresistible as mountain torrents! After a free expression of opinion all round, they turned almost instinctively to question the wan, sweet face of Widow Giles. She had been a silent, but attentive listener; and to the question asked her, "What do *you* say to such claims, Widow Giles?" she replied: "You, my friends, are Baptists, and I am a Methodist; and I would simply say, in the language of Paul, 'Do ye look on things after the outward appearance? If any man trust to himself that he is Christ's, let him of himself think this again, that as he is Christ's, even so are we Christ's.' 'He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not man, but God, who hath also given unto us his Holy Spirit.'"

This gentle rebuke stirred the already moving waters, and sunk deep into every soul. It was the still, small voice of God, reproving self-righteousness; and more than one turned away to hide their tears, and to question whether, in despising others of varying denominations—though perhaps almost unconsciously—they had not thereby despised God instead.

“Do you suppose she ever got hold of that book about the Methodists, which Father Longwind was circulating so carefully around here?” asked whisperingly one of another. “If I thought she had, I could never look her in the face again—never in the world.”

“My friends,” continued the Widow, looking up with a strangely sweet smile on her lips, “I entreat you as Christians, let us love one another. You know the Evangelist John testified: ‘He that saith he is in the light, and hateth his brother, is in darkness even until now.’ Again: ‘He that hateth his brother is a murderer, and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him.’ Let us not deceive ourselves,” she added, with a saddened, impressive look; “the word of God speaks to us plainly, and says, ‘If any man say he love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar.’ Let us love one another, for love is of God; and if we love one another, God dwelleth in us, the hope of the life that now is, and that which is to come. Let us love one another in Christian fellowship, and we shall feel the joys of heaven kindling in our souls even now.”

In the interval of silence which followed, they passed out one by one, revolving the question as they walked homeward, “What is it to love one another?” O that every Christian would ask himself this question prayerfully, and answer it prayerfully in the fear of God! There then would not only be peace between different denominations—all strifes, and prejudices, and sectarian broils be brought to an end—but also the bickerings, jealousies, slanders, and ill-feelings now existing among the members of individual churches, would be unknown! The aspersions and calumnies touching our brethren in Christ, started by the author of all evil, would not then meet with favor among professing Christians, and much less be endorsed and adopted by them, and extended beyond the pale of the church, to be made capital of by doubting, scoffing, and infidel men of

the world! Christians then would cease to countenance and to give currency to unfavorable reports of their brethren!

Elder Clayton was sitting quiet and contemplative in his own arm-chair, feeling a peace, which was almost a joy, settling its calm upon his soul. After they had all passed out from the recent discussion, he retired to his study and fell on his knees, and looked up to God in earnest prayer. And in his pleadings he approached so nearly the source of that Divine Love which permeates everywhere, and diffuses its sunshine throughout the utmost limits of the universe of God, as to drink in large draughts at the life-giving Fountain. All the sweetness and outgoings of his heart were centreing around one name, even as the sun's rays centre at one point; that name was JESUS! And as from one centre-piece the sun's rays, diverging, warm and vivify to the utmost limits of its far-off rolling orbs, so the light of love—even the love kindled at the altar of God—within his soul, was reaching out of itself as it never reached before, to kindle and to warm other souls at the same altar.

Elder Clayton felt, for the first time in his Christian life, that he could look up to his Heavenly Father and say that he loved the universal brotherhood of man, and especially the *entire* household of faith. He opened the Bible which lay on the table before him (perhaps unseen fingers directed the opening and the eye), and his first glance fell upon a passage regarding the righteousness through which we are justified before God. It declares that it is that "which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all that believe; for *there is no difference!*" What! no difference? Elder Clayton had read this passage many times before, but it surprised him now with a *new* meaning. What! no difference in the sight of God among those who believe? No difference! Elder Clayton pondered long upon this thought. "Where is boasting then?" adds the inspired pensman; and then answers, "it is excluded." Ah! would to God that it were wholly excluded, thought Elder Clayton, as

he closed the book. There then came up recollections of the past; and he called to mind that he had a brother somewhere in the Western wilds, traveling as a circuit-preacher. He had often thought of him before, but for many years only as a poor misguided brother whom God, though he might not utterly condemn, yet could not regard or receive with the same favor as those of "the regular apostolical church." Is he a Christian? O yes, certainly! I cannot doubt it. In what respect, then, am I better than he? Paul says there is no difference among those who believe. "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified"—how? By good works, so that some become more righteous than others, and thus have whereof to boast? No, says Paul, not by works, but—"freely by his grace, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus." If it is *by grace*, then it is a *gift*—the unmerited favor of God. It is Christ's righteousness, then, which is acceptable to God, and not *mine*; it is only imputed to me through faith in his blood. Can I plead more than is necessary to insure my acceptance? Can my brother plead less? Where then is boasting? I am satisfied that all these prejudices and fancies we indulge in, are human-drawn lines and distinctions, dictated by a pharisaical spirit, and unrecognized by the word of God. I have wronged my brother.—Elder Clayton seized his pen with tremulous grasp, and wrote hastily, while tears blinded his eyes. We glance over his shoulder, as we are passing out, just long enough to read the first sentence, on which a tear-drop has fallen—"Dear Brother in Christ Jesus our Lord."

In the lower garden by the brook-side was an arbor, over which a grape-vine had laced and interlaced its branches so as to completely shut it from the outer world. This was Anna's favorite retreat. In this shady recess, there had been born to Anna high thoughts and holy aspirations, whose influence had already started out upon the world to awaken kindred thoughts in surrounding minds—a rapidly widening circle, whose outer

limit could only be known to the Infinite. Anna had sought this covert at the close of the discussion, and was now sitting there in complete abstraction; singing a song of gratitude to God from her inmost soul, for the work already accomplished, and asking prayerfully, "Lord, what more hast thou for me to do?"

The sun's level rays sifted in among the purple grapes, and lit up her auburn curls, yet she noted neither time nor surroundings. One all-engrossing thought wholly occupied her mind, so that she perceived not that a sudden shadow chased out the sunlight, and that footsteps were approaching. Halley, lifting softly the trellised vines, stood before her.

"Anna!" he said, laying his hand lightly on her bowed head, and then seating himself beside her, "Anna, pardon my intrusion." He half smiled at her surprised questioning glance, and added: "I have come to talk with you on a subject which I am sure will be interesting, though foreign to the one which now occupies your thoughts. Do you remember," he continued, after a little pause, "the path which leads to Widow Giles' cottage, where it crosses the brook, and a willow droops its branches over brook and path? Did you never sit there sorrowing, that you knew nothing of your mother but her name?"

Anna's eyes dilated to a wondrous depth, and a quick flush mantling her cheek, revealed the sudden transition of her feelings.

"I understand—go on!" she said, with an agitated and somewhat husky voice.

"Long ago, there bloomed a second Eden, and two loving hearts reigned in it. Affection strung their souls in unison, and they gave forth sweet harmony with never a discordant note. Wealth, too, ministered to the gratification of their refined tastes, and God bestowed first a son and then a fair-haired daughter to gratify all the heart craves of earthly good. This Eden also had its tempter. The great adversary who walks up

and down in the earth, and to and fro in it, saw here too much of happiness for this sin-cursed world — his place of frequent resort—and he thereupon determined to blight it. In an evil moment, the husband, being far absent from home, was called suddenly to a still more distant State to see his aged father die. He delayed not a moment to comply with the demands of filial affection. He dropped his loving wife a hasty line to explain the necessity of his lengthened absence, and set out. The wife never received the letter. Months passed; and she, alarmed in the mean time at his long and unexpected absence, made inquiries in vain, and soon she only met with the whispers that he had proven false. False! — impossible! — it set her brain on fire. Still she waited, and he came not. Still she hoped even on the borders of despair, yet heard nothing to reveal the mystery. The tempter came and whispered, you have nothing to live for now — poison — she turned away with loathing. He pursued and threatened with taunting words, till she, maddened to phrenzy, with reason dethroned, snatched her youngest child from its crib, and fled out into the darkness of the world, and was never heard of more!”

“Oh! God — my mother — my mother!” exclaimed Anna, with a convulsive sob.

Halley drew her gently toward him, and continued: “The husband soothed his father’s last fading hours, closed his eyes in death, followed him to his final resting-place, and then started in haste on his return. But the coasting vessel he took passage on was wrecked, and he with most of the crew were picked up by a vessel bound to the West Indies. Anxiety for his family, and fatigues to which he had been exposed, brought on a fever, and delirium took possession of his mind, and months passed before he could write. And when he hastened back — though weak and feeble he could delay no longer — he found his own home a desolation. The idol of his bosom, dearer than life itself, had flown. The tempter and the tempted had disappeared

in one night, and madam Rumor shook her head with grave suspicion. No trace of the mother and child could ever be found. The grief-stricken man mourned for his wife and daughter more feelingly and bitterly than if he had followed them to the grave; and for months after he had given them up, he refused to be comforted. But at length when his grief had been softened by years, he looked around more hopefully, and at last took to himself another companion to gladden his old age, and he *yet lives.*"

Anna had arisen to her feet, shaken by strange emotions, and was now standing with lips slightly parted gazing at the speaker. "Tell me," she said, with a heaving bosom, and a hoarse and tremulous voice, "who is my father?"

"Your father is my father, Anna!"

"What!" exclaimed Anna.

"And you are my sister — my only sister — my long-lost sister!" Halley opened his arms, and she sunk within them, bursting into a flood of grateful tears.

"My brother! Is it possible that I have a brother — and a father, too?" she whispered half audibly. "God hath answered my prayer! God hath pitied the deep loneliness of my heart, and found me a brother! O God, I thank thee!" she continued, lifting her hands and tearful eyes toward heaven. "O God, my full heart crieth out, it is enough—it is enough!"

Halley clasped his new-found sister to his bosom, and whispered: "We must not be selfish in our joy. Remember there is an old man, whose hair was silvered in one grief-stricken night, who should share our joy. Anna, let us go home to our father. Shall we not set out immediately for home? I know you will there meet the full affection of an indulgent father; and one also will be there who will be to you as a mother, for well has she filled that trust towards me. O, Anna, we only lack you there to make our circle complete. And you will there find society more suited to your tastes, intellectually and

morally cultivated and refined, in which you are so well fitted to shine." Anna turned away to question her own heart; she called to mind how she had just been asking God to give her a work to do; and should she now turn away at such a time from this inviting field of labor?

"No, I cannot go with you *now*, my brother. God's claims are first. Do you not see the morning of his right hand of power in our midst? Do you not see his finger pointing out distinctly a great work here to be done? To-morrow will be the Sabbath. For the first time in my life, I expect to worship God where Christians of all names unite with equally acknowledged rights and privileges. O, my brother, what a day of rejoicing that will be to my soul! I have long prayed for it: thank God! he has given me power to labor for it, and I trust I can labor still more. When the work is accomplished here, and Zion stands out as fair as the sun, and strong in the power of her might, then — yes, then I will fly to my father's outstretched arms, and seek my duty in the dictates of filial love."

"Anna, I am reprovèd," replied Halley. "I will stay and labor with you till the indications of Providence permit us to return."

On the morrow, a Sabbath's stillness reigned. Even before the usual hour, the church was filled with a deeply interested and solemn congregation. Elder Clayton walked slowly up the aisle, and ascended the pulpit stairs. As he seated himself and looked around upon the thronged and breathlessly quiet house, all the events of the last week came crowding in upon his mind. The Communion with its effect, the angry interview, the excommunication, all came; and yet, he was in his accustomed place, and before his own beloved people, and every member of his own flock present to listen to his words of love and admonition. His emotions overpowered him. He tried in vain to calm himself for the opening service. At length he arose, and said: "Brethren, I cannot preach to you to-day, you

must preach to me. Let this be a meeting of conference and prayer, in which all shall feel free to express their thoughts and feelings. Deacon Briggs, will you open the services by reading a chapter from the word of God?"

The impressive stillness grew more intense as Deacon Briggs stepped forward and opened the Bible. Did unseen fingers direct his choice? He opened the book unwittingly, and said: "Let us read the fourth chapter of the first Epistle of John—'Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God: and this is that spirit of anti-Christ whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already it is in the world.'" Deacon Briggs paused. The last sentence had arrested the current of his thoughts as effectually as though an audible voice from heaven. He re-read it: 'And this is that spirit of anti-Christ whereof ye have heard.' He then went back and re-read the whole verse, and the effect, like an electric thrill, permeated from heart to heart. He closed the book, and said with an agitated voice: "I must confess to you, my brethren, I have been guilty of giving a meaning to this term to suit my own self-righteous heart. And I thought I was right, because I read it in a work from one of our most prominent men. But who *is* anti-Christ? It is he 'that confesseth not that Jesus is the Christ'—it is he 'who denieth the Father and the Son.' O, my brethren, if any of you have been guilty with me, of pointing out and stigmatizing as anti-Christ any part of God's family—any one being who confesseth Jesus Christ before men, let us in penitential sorrow get down before God; for we have egregiously sinned both against God and our fellow-man. My brethren, I have been guilty of calling the whole world anti-Christ—all but my own

church — those of my own faith and order. God forgive me, for I have sinned.”

The conscience-stricken man sank into a seat, and covered his face with his hands. Other heads drooped with similar feelings. But there were hearts and eyes in the congregation which were lifted up to God exultingly and with silent thanksgiving. “O God, thou hast heard our cries and hast come down.” A voice at length broke the searching stillness. And strangely sweet, after such a silence, did it sound. Deacon Simms, with his eyes on the same chapter, read: “Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love. In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another. If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us. Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit. And we have known and believed the love that God hath to us. God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him. And this commandment have we from him, That he who loveth God loveth his brother also.” Deacon Simms sat down, and soon was heard Anna’s clear voice flowing out feelingly in a familiar melody:

“Blest be the tie that binds
 Our hearts in Christian love;
 The fellowship of kindred minds
 Is like to that above.”

“Let us pray;” said the pastor, spreading out his hands over the people. And had not already every soul felt the peculiar presence of God in the assembly, they must have felt it ere that

prayer was ended. All hearts filled up and ran over with emotions of joy and penitential grief; and as these extremes met in each soul, there was an outbreking flood of tears. Then followed confessions, exhortations and prayer, glowing with feeling, and mighty with power. In the presence of God's Spirit the strong-hearted were melted like wax, and the proud were bowed down like reeds shaken in the wind. So nearly was this Christian communion an approach to a foretaste of heaven, with Jesus the center of all thought, that though the usual hour arrived to close, they seemed neither to mark the flight of time, nor feel fatigue.

“O now forever, God of love,
Let strife and hatred cease;
Let every heart harmonious move,
And every thought be—peace.”

“Peace I leave with you, *my peace I give unto you*; not as the world giveth, give I unto you.” This is the voice of the Master standing in the midst.

There was a movement near the door, and all eyes turned upon one who said: “I have to-day witnessed an unusual scene. Such scenes I used to dream of when reading God's word; and because I never saw them—because I never saw the spirit of love exhibited among Christians, I first came to doubt if all professing Christians were not hypocrites: then to doubt the Sacred Scriptures, and finally to doubt all things. But to-day I have seen God's power triumph over human passions, and I know and feel that there is a God, and that God is here. I feel strange and irresistible longings in my heart! It is Jesus calling after me, and I am resolved, through his grace strengthening me, to seek the salvation of my soul!”

The speaker was George Clayton. A thrill of joy shot through the father's heart. Anna, too, sent up a prayer of thanksgiving and praise—a sister's offering for a brother's conversion. This

was but the spark which fired the train. Others followed, and soon it was seen that there were many anxious souls crying out: "Lord, save, or I perish." The progress of the revival was uninterrupted. Sinners beheld the bleeding sacrifice upon the cross—marked the justice of an angry Father—and cried out in fear lest his rod smite them in judgment. A risen Savior gave them hope; and when they heard him calling after them: "Come unto me, all ye weary and heavy-laden, and I will give you rest—Take my yoke upon you and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye *shall find rest to your souls*:" then they were won by love, and hastened to swell the ranks of the people of God.

Scores found peace in believing. Not a family remained unvisited by the Spirit of God. The young and the aged bowed alike before the unseen power. And had our ears been purged from their grossness, we might have heard a shout resounding from the hilltops like that which startled the shepherds on the plains of Bethlehem: "Glory to God in the highest, peace on earth, good will toward men."

Weeks pass. Again a Sabbath dawns, cheered by an Autumn sun. There is something peculiarly impressive in the solemn quiet rest of a Sabbath in Autumn. The sun wheels slowly through a dreamy hazy atmosphere, with the fierceness of his glance subdued. The earth, with forests dressed in rainbow hues, and fields in brown, lulls the air to silence and the winds to rest—no sound, no motion!

Whilst we were engaged in thoughts kindred to these, the familiar plaintive sound of the church-bell spoke of other scenes. And as we watched the unrest of man, the rolling wheels, the gathering feet, all tending to that point where called the bell; we fancied that its voice of iron tongue, cleaving with quick wing the slumbering air, had waked echoes also in the court of heaven, and that angels entered the house of God along with the sons of men. And do you wonder why

angels gathered there? We read, that there is joy in heaven over *one* poor soul repentant; and here were many, "clothed and in their right mind," about to put on Jesus before the scoffing world. We glance around the densely-crowded courts, and behold they have come up as *one man* to unite in *one body* as a church—a union in which all members of Christ's family will have a home. It was not asked, are you of this stripe, or of that order? but, "Do you acknowledge the Lord Jehovah to be your God, the object of your supreme love—the Lord Jesus Christ your all-sufficient Savior, your only Redeemer—the Holy Ghost your Sanctifier and Comforter? Do you without reserve give yourselves away to God, to be his willing servants forever? Do you covenant to observe all his commands and ordinances in the closet, in the family, and in the sanctuary, remembering that every one of you shall give an account of himself unto God?" Around this, which is the Christian's faith, flocked Christians of every name, henceforth to be known only as Christians. Pastor and People, Excommunicators and Excommunicated, Immersionists, Sprinklers, and Pourers, all gathered around *one standard*—THE CROSS; recognizing but *one standard-bearer and Master*—CHRIST JESUS. It was a sight well worth a journey from heaven to witness! May this present generation witness many such scenes as this!

"Look! there is a familiar face in the pulpit, which carries us back in remembrance to the old Academy place, and to the communion season there. How unlike that scene is this! Yet we can trace the relation of cause and effect; that was the sowing of the good seed, and this but the harvest. Glorious harvest for thee, thou faithful laborer in thy Master's service! Thy God hath sent thee back to reap! Count the sheaves as they gather around the altar, and say, Is it not enough? Elder Clayton was there also, by his side, and assisted in the duties of the day, and in the administering of the ordinances.

There before the altar stands Anna, with a face radiant with

holy joy. Mary, her faithful friend, is beside her; and George too, earnest and prayerful. And on either side, gathered with them, are children, with their youthful voices just tuned to praise; young men and women, the middle-aged, and the old, with eyes dimmed and steps tottering. Does it not gladden thy heart, thou servant of the mighty God? Go on, then, preaching LOVE, the burden of the Gospel of peace; love—love to God, and love to man.

When they were all gathered around him, the man of God opened the Bible, and read: "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty" (2 Cor. vi. 17, 18). Then he administered unto them their solemn vows. And should any inquire *how* they were baptized, we answer, with water, before the altar, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. And as his hand rested on Anna's forehead, he said, in the language of Paul (Titus iii. 5-7): "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." And as he passed back to the pulpit, he said: "Now are ye one body in Christ Jesus. Ye have *one Lord*, even your God, whom ye have this day acknowledged. *One Spirit*, by which ye grasp the merits of a risen Savior. *One baptism*, for by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. Behold!" he continued, in the language of Scripture; "'One body, one Spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and

through all, and in you all.' Bless God for evermore! Amen and amen."

Then were uncovered the sacred elements; and he who ministered in God's name, casting his eyes over the sea of faces moistened with tears, exclaimed: "Jesus saith, I am the bread of life. If any man eat this bread, he shall live forever. If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." Then after silently breaking the bread, and pouring out the wine, he extended his hands towards the recently warring masses before him, now resolved into *one* by the power of love, and exclaimed: "'This cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?' O beloved, remember, 'We being many, are one bread and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread'" (1 Cor. x. 16, 17).

What a precious season was this to Christian souls! Should it be wondered at if souls, breathing such teachings as their native air, lose their fierceness, and no longer strive about words to no profit, divided often by nothing but a *name*? Would they go thence telling how much more acceptable to God they were than their brethren? How much more they will be rewarded for their works of righteousness? theirs being more righteous than their fellows, all works but theirs to be burned and suffer loss? Poor self-righteous, foolish mortals! You have yet to learn that all your righteousness is as filthy rags; and that every trembling repentant soul can plead enough of the righteousness of Christ — which is *alone* acceptable to God — to be justified and received by him; and you, proud as you are, *can do no more*. "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own Master he standeth or falleth; yea, he shall be holpen up, for God is able to make him stand." Go thou, remember the Pharisee and Publican, and which of

the two was justified. "Every one that exalteth himself shall be abased, and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted."

There was one intensely interested spectator of these scenes. We saw him talking with Halley before service; and although his form was somewhat bowed, and his hair grey, yet we could see that their features were cast in much the same mould. We noticed also his eager gaze resting on Anna, as she stood before the altar paying her vows to God, and entering into solemn covenant with Jehovah. "Anna, come this way," said Halley, as they passed out of the church after service. She was surprised at the request, and more still at the direction taken; but she followed on unquestioningly from the vestibule to a side passage which opened into the village church-yard. Standing underneath a whispering pine in an obscure corner, and half leaning on a marble headstone, was an aged man whom they approached. As Anna's eyes first rested on him, she paused, and turning deadly pale, looked thoughts she dared not utter. Halley only replied by drawing her arm within his own, and leading her onward.

"Anna, your father!—Father, your long-lost child!"

"O God, I thank thee!" burst from the full hearts of both parent and daughter. Anna was pressed with passionate fondness to a father's bosom, in whose arms she had not rested since a little prattling child. Tears, such as strong men weep when shaken by powerful emotions, dropped slowly from the old man's furrowed cheeks. Tears—full, bright drops—dimmed Anna's eyes; but hers were tears of unmixed joy—his wrung from bitter memories which obscured the present.

"Anna, my child!" he said at length, when he had sufficiently recovered his voice, "you remember your mother's death-bed; tell me where they laid her."

Startled by this forced remembrance, she glanced around the obscure corner, up at the overshadowing pine, down then at a nameless headstone; and pointing toward a flowing vine her

own hand had planted, exclaimed, with a burst of tears which told how grief upheaves the soul as winds the ocean, "It is there they laid her, dear father; and oh! how lonely I have been since!"

For fifteen summers had the grass spread its velvet softness over that cold bosom there inhumed. But could her glad spirit have looked down from those bright mansions of rest provided for the dead who die in the Lord, upon these loved ones for the first time met here to weep over her ashes, methinks she would have whispered: "Weep on, yet not without hope; 'for they who sow in tears shall reap in joy.' Weep on, for tears shall unloosen your sorrows, and soon we shall meet where no tears are known. Each humid gem, that falls wrung out with holy sorrow, by angel hands is gathered ere the thirsty clods drink it, and thence transplanted into heavenly soil, behold, it springs up with richest bloom and sweetest fragrance, self-wreathed in garlands to bedeck your brows in Paradise!"

The old man—old rather from grief than years—as he stood over his long-lost partner's grave, lifted up his hands as though in benediction, and with words not unmixed with tears, feelingly exclaimed: "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors. Let us weep no more now; she is at rest. Oh! you know not what a load of sorrow and bitterness it has lifted from my heart, to know that hers is not a dishonored grave. I bless God that it is even as it is. Let us go hence, and so live that we may meet her when our labors, like hers, are ended."

"I am thinking," said Anna, "to what seraphic stature she has already grown. Fifteen years of expansion in heavenly air, with never a blight—truth unmixed with error as her daily food—and all these earthly fetters cast off which dwarf us here. O, how her glad spirit must reach out, and reaching, grasp more and more of the fullness of God, and of the mysteries of his grace!"

“Yes,” replied Halley, interruptedly catching the glorious thought, and with his eyes turned toward the halo-begirded sun. “When the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll, and this proud earth flee away from the presence of its Creator, and thou bright sun with all thy splendor shall be clothed in sackcloth, and wander amid the darkness of eternal space, seeking thy funeral urn with all the universe of God; then man’s existence shall have just begun! Then having shaken off this mortal clog which chained his spirit down to earth, without hindrance more,

‘The man emerges—mounts above the wreck,
As towering flame from Nature’s funeral pyre,
And vies with angels!’”

“Oh! how glorious that will be!” exclaimed Anna. “I almost long,”—she paused, and then added in the language of Paul: “For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and be with Christ, which is far better.”

“Do you forget the work to which you have devoted yourself?” asked Halley. “Is there nothing to live for?”

“Yes, much to live for. A work—a glorious work lies before every one. And may God grant that Christ may be magnified in me, whether it be by life or death. ‘For to me to live is Christ, but—to die is gain.’”

With such conversation they beguiled the way homeward. Little by little the father caught the outlines of the great and all-absorbing thought which was moulding the character of his daughter.

“Father,” she said, pausing on the brow of the hill within the grateful shade of an overhanging maple, “if I could only live to see the strifes and discords in all Christendom healed, and all Christians ONE in the bonds of peace; I could then, like Simeon of old, say: ‘Now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace; for mine eyes hath seen thy salvation.’”

The father looked with surprise at the young girl radiant in

the first freshness of womanhood, marked the unconscious grace of mien, so much like her mother, noticed the play of the wind among the curls that kissed her brow, heeded the sanguine joyousness of her disposition, and the brilliancy of her intelligent speaking eyes; he observed all these, and more: he regarded with admiration the sweet and holy enthusiasm of her soul, which sparkled and shone through all her actions. But we would not attempt to unravel the secret and complicated workings of the father's heart while he thus gazed. God only knows why he, like many others, should seek to dissuade from laboring for an object which he professedly longed and prayed for—but so it was. We only point out the weakness, and say, God pity and forgive!

“It is well enough, my daughter, to do what one can,” he said. “But I have studied the human heart so many years that I begin to doubt whether this can ever be accomplished.”

“Should I study the human heart, father, I too might doubt,” replied Anna; “for I know the fruits of the unrenewed heart are ‘hatred, variance, wrath, strife, seditions, and heresies;’ but in the power of God’s Spirit I trust; and just as surely as there is a God, it will be accomplished. God has promised that the divisions of Zion shall be healed, and that there shall be a reign of peace; ‘when the Spirit shall be poured upon us from on high, and the wilderness be a fruitful field. Then shall judgment dwell in the wilderness, and righteousness remain in the fruitful field. And the works of righteousness shall be *peace*, and the effects of righteousness, quietness and assurance forever.’ Yes,” repeated Anna, “*quietness and assurance forever*. Thus saith the Lord, and he will accomplish it. I rest my faith on his word, not doubtingly, but with the full trust that through willing instruments he will work out this end. Look at what he has done here during the past few weeks! Look at what he is doing everywhere, and say: ‘Watchman, what of the night? Is there no promise of the morning?’”

“It is not to be denied, my daughter, that there is a wonderful change in this respect. Nor can it be doubted that there is, to some degree, a feeling of unity springing up among the churches. But the question is, will it ever mould them into one?”

“If they are moulded in spirit,” replied Anna, “it matters but little by what names they may choose to be called; though it would scarce be wise, perhaps, to keep up a show of difference where none existed. Let Christians worship together in one temple, let them meet around one mercy-seat, and bear each other up on wings of prayer, let them meet around one table to commemorate the sufferings of their dying Lord, let them unite in their efforts for good, and for the extension of religious teachings, and for the promotion of the cause of their common Master; then they will irresistibly flock together in unity and love. There will not only be a spirit of unanimity, but of uniformity in all their actions and teachings. If ministers of the Gospel would but heed the admonition of Paul: ‘Of these things put them in remembrance, *charging them before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers;*’ how the work would spread! I thank God that there are many such faithful ministers of the Gospel now, and they are rapidly increasing. There are some stumbling-blocks who put themselves in the way, not only by withholding this part of the counsel of God, but also by preaching sectarianism and engendering strifes, and embittering party feelings; but if they persist, *they may expect to be put out of the way;* for God’s power is in the movement, and the masses are stirring.”

“It may be so,” said the father, musingly.

Halley, who stood watching the two with quiet interest, and seeing that an impression was being made on his father’s mind, sought to deepen it. “In many country places,” he said, “and also in villages, and large towns even, there are Christians of several different orders intermingled in a civil and social ca-

capacity, who, keeping themselves carefully distinct in religious matters, are all so weak as scarcely to sustain a teacher of the commonest kind; and many indeed are unable to do even this, and so they dwindle and starve. Sometimes a spirit of rivalry creeps in between different denominations, and they lay to for church edifices, each striving to build the largest and the most expensive, and thereby they involve themselves beyond their means by endeavoring to build two or more churches, when one were large enough for the whole community. So under this pecuniary incubus self-placed upon their shoulders, they are obliged to struggle and groan for years, and perhaps lose their building; besides suffering more or less disrapture, if not an entire breaking up of their church organization in that community. At times, a considerable number of Christians will remain a large fraction, if not the whole, of their lives in an unorganized state, overawed by a stronger growth of different orders in the same vicinity, so that they, discouraged, aimless, and almost lifeless, do not accomplish anything in their Master's service, and go shrivelled and shamefaced to render up their accounts to God. This is only a slight glimpse at the evils which grow out of these divisions. Could I tell of only half the hatred, evil speaking, backbiting, bitter emulations, anger, hopes shipwrecked, and souls lost resulting therefrom, it would fill a thousand volumes, and make the blood run chill with horror!"

"And all this," said Anna, "is done in the name of God and religion! But the immolation of human sacrifices on heathen altars is more excusable, it seems to me, in the sight of a holy God! Yea, I would rather be a worshipper of heathen deities, than a professing Christian wrapped in robes of self-righteousness, and sowing seeds of discord among the members of God's family! 'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven.'"

"I know this is all true," said the father; "I only hesitated

because I feared it was useless to make the effort to remove the evil."

"So Moses feared," replied Anna, "when God told him to go and deliver his people from bondage. He was sure that nothing could be done—at least that *he* could do nothing: forgetting, indeed, that he was not expected to lean upon an arm of flesh."

"You are right, Anna, my daughter, and I am wrong. I must talk with you again about this."

"I am sure that any one can do a great deal, through God strengthening him, if his heart is only in the work;" continued Anna.

"Yes, my daughter, if we put our trust in God; but if we were expected to work in our own strength, I am certain we could accomplish nothing."

"It seems to me," continued Anna, her face still glowing with her thoughts, "it seems to me that God has provided for his servants a vast armory, and bids them go, choose their own weapons. Some, in culpable haste, seize only a beetle, and rush out and deal blows hither and yon, knowing not to what purpose. Some are content with a naked sword only, wherewith they cut and slash, right and left, mistaking friends for foes, and distinguishing neither. Others, heeding the heavenly admonitions and counsels, put on the whole armor of God, taking 'the breast-plate of righteousness,' 'having their feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace,' procuring the 'shield of faith,' and taking the 'helmet of salvation and the sword of the Spirit,' they are rendered strong in the power of God's might, and become puissant in courage to do, and in fortitude to bear."

They had now reached the porch, where Elder Clayton met them with a hearty welcome, his whole face glowing with the sunlight of love. "I welcome you," he said as the Elder Halley was introduced; "I welcome you as the father of my

precious child. Anna, my dear, God has blessed you as you deserve; and I know you will not let these new ties of filial and fraternal love sever the old. You will, I know, only open your heart and make room for more. O what a Sabbath! What a feast we have had to-day! It seemed to me almost like heaven come down to earth!"

"It bodes the brightness of the coming time, we hope," said Halley.

"Yes, yes, it has been the happiest day of my life," said Elder Clayton; thoughtfully. "My friend," he continued, addressing Halley, senior, "you should have attended our Union prayer meetings during the last month. God's presence has been almost visible, and his Spirit is still searching out the impenitent, and bringing them in. You have seen the result to-day—a Union church, and fifty-nine souls, lately cleansed, added to its members; more are coming, and still the work goes on. My soul can hardly contain itself for joy! What now to me are all the little differences which have separated Christian hearts? They are as nothing. My only concern now is for the salvation of perishing souls, knowing I must give a strict account to God for my own actions only, and that my brother must do the same. Baptists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Methodists, Episcopalians, Lutherans, etc., meet now in unanimity to worship God in Spirit and in truth. Christ is all, and in all, and we heed the warning of the Apostle: 'Let the peace of God dwell in your hearts, to the which also ye are called in one body; and be ye thankful.' Yes, we *are* thankful, and we bless God for it."

"But are you not afraid these prejudices will spring up again?" asked the elder Halley. "I always thought them exceedingly hard to uproot. You know that revival seasons, precious as they are, will pass over, and then different feelings come up; we get cold and worldly, and shortly discover that everybody else is going wrong but ourselves."

“I see no necessity of this,” said Elder Clayton, in reply. “Avoid the cause, and we avoid the effect. I think we have here raised an impassable embankment against the encroachments of the adversary. We now labor and pray together; our interests and our aims are identical, we have nothing left to contend about.”

“I think the main difficulty,” said Halley, the younger, ‘lies not in the masses, but in the Gospel teachers, falsely so called; for they have not the spirit of the Gospel in their hearts. I never yet heard of a serious contention in a Christian community, but it was begun, and afterward fanned and fed, by a man who thought God had called him to preach, not the Gospel of peace, but sectarian creeds.’”

“We are told,” said Anna, musingly, “that the fruit of the Spirit is first righteousness, and then peace; and that ‘all the law is fulfilled in one word—in this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another’” (Eph. v. 14, 15).

“How much there is in the word of God on this subject,” said Elder Clayton. “Why, it underlies almost every thought, on every page. God knew how difficult it would be for us to practise this; and as though determined to arrest our attention and enforce its peculiar importance in the system of grace, he accompanied it with threatenings and promises, with admonitions and reproofs, thus making it all things to all men, that it might not fail to reach some.”

“I do’nt know but this is true,” said the elder Halley; “and if it is, the Christian world has been strangely blind and slow to learn.”

“Yes, but I can’t so much wonder,” replied Elder Clayton, “or, at least, it ill becomes me to condemn, when I remember that for twenty years that part of the word of God was sealed to me. I had not the slightest conception of its existence—I was a blind leader of the blind. Now it meets my eyes every-

where. Love—love to God and love to man. I hear angels hymning it when on errands of mercy to this fallen world. I hear the Psalmist singing it, holy prophets repeating it, and Jehovah proclaiming it amid the thunders of Sinai, with a voice that shakes the earth and heavens. Jesus, the Eternal Son of the Father, came to teach, by his own example, how to love one another; and his twelve Apostles taught everywhere, saying: ‘This commandment have we from him, That he who loveth God loveth his brother also.’”

“Paul repeated it so many times,” said Anna, “that he seemed half-inclined to leave it out of his Epistle to the Thessalonians, knowing that they were more given to love. I fancy he paused and looked up questioningly, when the Spirit whispered, ‘Write, there is no danger of repeating it too often;’ and so he added: ‘But as touching brotherly-love ye need not that I write unto you: for ye yourselves are taught of God to love one another. And indeed ye do it toward all the brethren which are in Macedonia; but we beseech you, brethren, that ye increase more and more.’ He seemed to have no fears that they could love too much; and whilst commending them for what they already exercised, bade them increase more and more in love toward—not the brethren of their own church simply, or those of Macedonia only, for which love he had just applauded them, but—all the brethren of whatever name, and wherever dwelling throughout the wide world. I do’nt believe they ever contended about mere forms and non-essentials to that degree, that they gave loose rein to their evil passions and denounced those differing from them only in such, as ‘impious,’ ‘servants of the devil,’ as committing ‘sacrilege before high heaven,’ as ‘anti-Christ,’ etc. Not only withholding church-fellowship, but also refusing church recognition; denouncing their ordinances as ‘solemn mockeries,’ their ministers as having ‘no ministerial character,’ and denying that they should be so ‘recognized by admittance into the pulpit’ even! And

then, as in a paroxysm of sectarian frenzy, and as though summing up the whole category of evils, throw all Christendom who differed on any point from themselves, into 'Mystical Babylon!'

"O, Anna! Anna; do't recall those wicked remarks, they are like the recollections of a horrid dream!" exclaimed Elder Clayton, as he turned away with a look of real pain. There followed a season of silence, during which each one was forcibly impressed, as he recalled the past, with the contrast between the works of love and of hate.

At length dinner was announced, after which, Elder Clayton said: "Come, my friends, let us change the scene; it is time for the Union Prayer Meeting."

The meeting had commenced when they reached the church, and a song of praise arising from devout hearts, was ascending as sweet incense before God. O, what power there is in song, when it bursts as the spontaneous language of human hearts! It has power to reach other hearts, and to set them all on fire with religious ardor.

"O Lord, I love thy service now,
Thy church displays thy power."

There were familiar faces there also, whose hearts were pervaded with a spirit of brotherly love and unity. Father Long wind's heart had been touched by the Spirit of God's love, and Elder Mason and Squire Tanner were also present, to stay Elder Clayton's hands in furthering the good work. Ere the meeting closed, Halley, the elder, resolved to go home and to forward more earnestly the union prayer meeting in his own village. There was still existing much sectarian spirit there, which he hoped by the grace of God to be able to overcome.

"Anna, my child," he said on the morrow, "you will go back with me; and, I think that with you and Henry to aid me, a work shall be accomplished to the glory of Zion."

“Heaven speed the work!” said Elder Clayton, “although it robs me of my child. Go, and God be with you, and bless you!”

When all Christian hearts are thus glowing with love to God and man; then soon the sombre shade of wickedness, error and misery, which have so long shrouded the earth, shall be dissipated! The day-star of righteousness, truth, love, and peace, shall be ushered in as the glorious harbinger of a still more glorious morning to the world!—as the bright refulgent dawning of that period when the dark corners of this long-benighted earth shall be illumined, and the last remnant of enervating delusion dispelled.

“And see!

’Tis come, the glorious morn! the second birth!
And earth holds jubilee! Awaking Nature hears
The new-creating word, and starts to life! She
Rises in ev’ry heighten’d form, set free from
Pain and death. Then, LOVE and TRUTH o’ersweep
All woes, all tears, all time, all fears; and sweet
From that celestial voice the music flows,
Proclaiming to our heroes blest repose.”

THE END.





UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 002571211

